arXiv:hep-th/0601168v1 23 Jan 2006

A BPHZ convergence proof in Euclidean position space

Chris Austin[1]
33 Collins Terrace, Maryport, Cumbria CA15 8DL, England

Abstract

Two BPHZ convergence theorems are proved directly in Euclidean position space, without exponentiating the propagators, making use of the Cluster Convergence Theorem presented previously. The first theorem proves the absolute convergence of arbitrary BPHZ-renormalized Feynman diagrams, when counterterms are allowed for one-line-reducible subdiagrams, as well as for one-line-irreducible subdiagrams. The second theorem proves the conditional convergence of arbitrary BPHZ-renormalized Feynman diagrams, when counterterms are allowed only for one-line-irreducible subdiagrams. Although the convergence in this case is only conditional, there is only one natural way to approach the limit, namely from propagators smoothly regularized at short distances, so that the integrations by parts needed to reach an absolutely convergent integrand can be carried out, without picking up short-distance surface terms. Neither theorem requires translation invariance, but the second theorem assumes a much weaker property, called "translation smoothness". Both theorems allow the propagators in the counterterms to differ, at long distances, from the propagators in the direct terms. For massless theories, this makes it possible to eliminate all the long-distance divergences from the counterterms, without altering the propagators in the direct terms. Massless theories can thus be studied directly, without introducing a regulator mass and taking the limit as it tends to zero, and without infra-red subtractions.

Preface

BPHZ renormalization was introduced by Bogoliubov and Parasiuk [1, 2, 3], following earlier work by Dyson [4, 5], and Salam [6, 7]. A BPHZ convergence proof, in the parameter space of the exponentiated propagators, was given by Hepp [8]. A power-counting convergence theorem, in Euclidean momentum space, was proved by Weinberg [9], and a simplified version of the theorem was proved by Hahn and Zimmermann [10]. The theorem was extended to Minkowski signature by Zimmermann [11].

---

[1] Email: chrisaustin@ukonline.co.uk

These theorems were used to give a BPHZ convergence proof, in momentum space, by Zimmermann [12].

The aim of the present paper, and the preceding one, [13], is to find out how to calculate BPHZ-renormalized Feynman diagrams, directly in Euclidean position space, without exponentiating the propagators. The original motivation was to study the renormalization of the Group-Variation Equations [14, 15]. A brief discussion of the problems involved, and the way they are overcome, is given in Section 6.3 of [14].

The Cluster Convergence Theorem [13] is intended to serve as a position-space substitute for Weinberg's momentum-space power counting theorem, giving a guarantee that a position-space integral will converge, if the integrand satisfies certain bounds. The present paper gives a way, for an arbitrary BPHZ-renormalized position-space integrand, of cutting up the Cartesian product, of the configuration space of the vertices, and the list of all the forests, into a finite number of sectors, each of which is, itself, the Cartesian product, of a subset of the configuration space of the vertices, and a suitable set of forests, such that the bounds on the integrand, required to apply the Cluster Convergence Theorem, can be proved to hold, in each sector. The idea of σ-clusters, used in the Cluster Convergence Theorem, arose from seeking an analogue, in position space, of the momentum space "clusters", used by 't Hooft [16].

What follows this preface is the LaTeX2e transcription of my 1993 paper, with references added. Conventions, some definitions, and some basic combinatoric results, are given in Section 2, on page 21. The Cluster Convergence Theorem is reviewed in Section 3, on page 27. The sectors described above are constructed in Section 4, on page 29. The BPHZ integrands, for the forests in such a sector, are combined, by means of the Taylor remainder formula, into a form suitable for bounding, in Section 5, on page 73. The main result of Section 5 is Lemma 22, on page 93.

The First Convergence Theorem, in Section 6, on page 101, establishes the absolute convergence, in Euclidean position space, of an arbitrary BPHZ-renormalized Feynman diagram, when counterterms are permitted for one-line reducible subdiagrams, as well as for one-line irreducible subdiagrams. Translation invariance is not required.

The Second Convergence Theorem, in Section 7, on page 135, establishes the conditional convergence, in Euclidean position space, of an arbitrary BPHZ-renormalized Feynman diagram, when counterterms are permitted only for one-line irreducible subdiagrams. Although the convergence is only conditional, there is only one natural way to approach the limit, namely by smooth short-distance regularizations of the propagators, so that the integrations by parts, needed to reach absolutely convergent integrands, can be performed without picking up short-distance surface terms. The result is demonstrated to be independent of the details, of the smooth short-distance regularizations of the propagators, provided they satisfy the broad requirements given. Once the integrations by parts are done, the short-distance regularizations of the propagators can be dropped. Translation invariance is not required, but a much weaker property, called translation smoothness, is assumed.

The proof of the Second Convergence Theorem, Theorem 2, on page 166, involves the addition and subtraction of additional counterterms for one-line reducible subdiagrams, which are then shown to be conditionally convergent. This method enables the integrations by parts to be done, after a suitable change of variables, without crossing the boundaries of the sectors, that the Cartesian product of the configuration space of the vertices, and the list of all the forests, is cut up into, for the application of the Cluster Convergence Theorem. The necessary algebraic identities are established in Lemma 34, on page 154, and Lemma 35, on page 155.

The results in Sections 2 to 7 are presented in a general form, without specific reference to Feynman diagrams, and the application of the results of these sections, to BPHZ-renormalized Feynman diagrams, is explained in Section 8, on page 223.

Both the convergence theorems allow the use of propagators, in the counterterms, which differ, at long distances, from the propagators in the direct terms, so that, for theories with massless particles, the long-distance divergences, in the counterterms, can be cut off, without altering the propagators in the direct terms. The form of the long distance cutoff, allowed for the propagators, in the counterterms, is that the propagator is multiplied by a factor, that is equal to 1, when the distance between the propagator ends is less than a fixed, nonzero, distance, then decreases smoothly, from 1, to 0, as the distance between the propagator ends increases, to a larger fixed distance, then is equal to 0, when the distance, between the propagator ends, is greater than the larger fixed distance. This factor is assumed to be continuously differentiable, as many times as needed. For theories with dimensional transmutation, such as QCD, the fixed, nonzero, distance, at which the smooth long-distance cutoffs of the propagators in the counterterms commence, can serve as the origin of the renormalization mass scale, while for theories with a dimensional coupling constant, such as gravity, the long-distance cutoffs would commence at a numerical multiple of the distance defined by the dimensional coupling constant. The idea of seeking a BPHZ convergence proof, in which the propagators, in the counterterms, are allowed to differ, at large distances, from the propagators in the direct terms, so that, for theories with massless particles, the non-physical infra-red divergences, which the standard BPHZ method produces in the counterterms, would not occur, was suggested by a method used to calculate certain UV counterterms, by Chetyrkin, Kataev, and Tkachov [17].

If long-distance cutoffs on massless propagators in the counterterms, as allowed by the convergence proofs in the present paper, are not used, then for theories with massless particles, it is necessary to use the BPHZL method [18, 19, 20, 21], which involves introducing a regulator mass for massless particles, performing the usual BPHZ subtractions in the presence of the regulator mass, to remove the UV divergences, then performing further subtractions, around the limit of zero regulator mass, to remove the IR divergences, before the regulator mass is allowed to tend to zero. This method was recently used in [22].

The existence of overlapping divergences means that the way the BPHZ forests are grouped into good sets of forests, such that the short-distance divergences cancel between the members of a good set of forests, has to be different, in different regions of the configuration space of the vertices of the diagram, just as it has to be different, in different regions of the parameter space of the exponentiated propagators, in Hepp's method, and in different regions of momentum space, in Zimmerman's method. In the present paper, the basis of the contruction of the good sets of forests, for each position-space configuration, x, of the vertices of the Feynman diagram, is the definition, on page 37, of a set, $\Omega(x)$, whose members are pairs, (F, G), of forests, such that $F \subseteq G$, and each member, A, of G, that is not a member of F, is, in an appropriate sense, a "cluster", in the position-space configuration, x, of the vertices of the diagram, after contracting all the members of F that are strict subsets of A, and ignoring the positions of the outer ends of any legs of A, that lie outside a member of F that contains A as a strict subset. The idea is that a "cluster" is a subdiagram whose vertices are all close to one another, in the position-space configuration, x, of the vertices of the diagram, and thus may need to have a counterterm subtracted, in order to cancel an ultraviolet divergence, that would otherwise come from somewhere near x, in the configuration space of the vertices of the diagram. An example of what can go wrong, if one does not contract the members of F, that are strict subsets of A, before applying the "cluster" condition, is given on pages 159 to 160 of [14]. The precise definition, of a "cluster", is chosen so that one obtains Lemma 7, on page 43, Lemma 10, on page 56, and Lemma 11, on page 58. Lemma 7 states that if (F, G) and (F', G') are members of $\Omega(x)$, such that $(F \cup F') \subseteq (G \cap G')$, then $G \cup G'$ is a forest, and $((F \cap F'), (G \cup G'))$ is a member of $\Omega(x)$. Once one has Lemma 7, it follows by combinatorics alone, in Lemma 8, on page 50, and Lemma 9, on page 55, independent of the details of the definition of a "cluster", that for any forest, F, there is a unique member, (P, Q), of $\Omega(x)$, such that $P \subseteq F \subseteq Q$ holds, and there is no member, (P', Q'), of $\Omega(x)$, different from (P, Q), such that $P' \subseteq P$ and $Q \subseteq Q'$ both hold. The good set of forests, to which the forest, F, belongs, at the position-space configuration, x, of the vertices of the diagram, is then the set of all the forests, G, such that $P \subseteq G \subseteq Q$ holds. And if (P, Q) is a member of $\Omega(x)$, that defines a good set of forests, in this way, then Lemma 10 gives lower bounds, used on page 122, on the diameters, in the position space configuration, x, of the vertices of the diagram, of the members, A, of P, that have two or more vertices, after contracting the members of P that are strict subdiagrams of A, and Lemma 11, used on page 131, ensures that if A is either the whole diagram, or a member of P, that has two or more vertices, then, after contracting the members of P, that are strict subdiagrams of A, the connected components of any σ-cluster, of the restriction of the diagram to A, are, under appropriate conditions, members of $(Q \vdash P)$.

It seems possible that analogues of the set $\Omega(x)$, described above, might also be used as the basis for constructing good sets of forests, in the parameter space of the exponentiated propagators, and in momentum space. The situation is simplest in the space of the integration parameters of the exponentiated propagators, usually called the α-parameters, because the R-operation does not change the value of the α-parameter of a line, whereas it does change the lengths of lines, and the diameters of subdiagrams, in position space, because it changes the positions of the inner ends of the legs of a subdiagram, when that subdiagram is contracted, and it also changes the magnitudes of the line momenta, in momentum space, because it sets the external momenta of a subdiagram to zero, in the internal lines of that subdiagram, when that subdiagram is contracted.

An example of a definition of $\Omega(\alpha)$, in the parameter space of the exponentiated propagators, broadly analogous to the definition of $\Omega(x)$, and for which an analogue of Lemma 7 can be derived, is as follows. For each forest, F, subdiagram, A, and assignment, α, of the values of the α-parameters of the lines of the diagram, we define $\lambda(F, A, \alpha)$ to be the maximum value of α_Δ, among the internal lines, Δ, of A, that are not internal lines of any member, of F, that is a strict subset of A. This implies that for forests, F, and G, such that $F \subseteq G$, $\lambda(G, A, \alpha) \leq \lambda(F, A, \alpha)$ holds. We then define $\Omega(\alpha)$ to be the set of all ordered pairs, (P, Q) of forests of one-line-irreducible subdiagrams, such that $P \subseteq Q$, and such that, for all $A \in (Q \vdash P)$, and for every line, Δ, with one end in A, and its other end not in A, but not outside any member of Q, if any, that contains A as a strict subset, $\lambda(Q, A, \alpha) < \alpha_\Delta$. One can prove that this definition implies that, if $(P, Q) \in \Omega(\alpha)$, and A is a connected subdiagram, with at least two vertices, then $\lambda(Q, A, \alpha) = \lambda(P, A, \alpha)$. Hence for all F, such that $P \subseteq F \subseteq Q$, $\lambda(F, A, \alpha) = \lambda(Q, A, \alpha) = \lambda(P, A, \alpha)$. To prove the analogue of Lemma 7, suppose that $(P, Q) \in \Omega(\alpha)$ and $(P', Q') \in \Omega(\alpha)$, and $(P \cup P') \subseteq (Q \cap Q')$. Suppose some member, A, of $Q \vdash P$, overlaps some member, A', of $Q' \vdash P'$. For any ordered pair, (F, C), of a forest, F, and a member, C, of F, let $\mathcal{T}(F, C)$ denote the set of all the members, D, of F, such that $C \subseteq D$. Then $\mathcal{T}(F, C)$ is a nonempty finite set, totally ordered by the subset relation. Now let B be the largest member of $\mathcal{T}(Q, A)$, that overlaps any member of $\mathcal{T}(Q', A')$, and let B' be the largest member of $\mathcal{T}(Q', A')$ that overlaps any member of $\mathcal{T}(Q, A)$. Then B overlaps B', B' does not overlap any member of Q, that contains B as a strict subset, and B does not overlap any member of Q', that contains B' as a strict subset. Hence there is a line, Δ, with one end in $(B \cap B')$, and its other end in B', but not in B, and not outside any member of Q, that contains B as a strict subset, and there is a line, Δ', with one end in $(B \cap B')$, and its other end in B, but not in B', and not outside any member of Q', that contains B' as a strict subset. Then $(P, Q) \in \Omega(\alpha)$ implies that $\lambda(Q, B, \alpha) < \alpha_\Delta \leq \lambda(P', B', \alpha)$, and $(P', Q') \in \Omega(\alpha)$ implies that $\lambda(Q', B', \alpha) < \alpha_{\Delta'} \leq \lambda(P, B, \alpha)$. But $(P \cup P') \subseteq (Q \cap Q')$ implies that $P \subseteq (P \cup P') \subseteq Q$, and $P' \subseteq (P \cup P') \subseteq Q'$, hence $\lambda((P \cup P'), B, \alpha) < \lambda((P \cup P'), B', \alpha)$, and $\lambda((P \cup P'), B', \alpha) < \lambda((P \cup P'), B, \alpha)$, which is a contradiction. Hence no member of Q overlaps any member of Q', so $(Q \cup Q')$ is a forest. Now let A be any member of $(Q \cup Q') \vdash (P \cap P')$, and Δ be any line, with one end in A, and its other end not in A, but not outside any member of $(Q \cup Q')$, if any, that contains A as a strict subset. Then $(P \cup P') \subseteq (Q \cap Q')$ implies that either $A \in Q \vdash P$ or $A \in Q' \vdash P'$. Suppose $A \in Q \vdash P$. The end of Δ, that is not in A, is not outside any member of Q, that contains A as a strict subset, hence $(P, Q) \in \Omega(\alpha)$ implies $\lambda(Q \cup Q', A, \alpha) \leq \lambda(Q, A, \alpha) < \alpha_\Delta$. The result $\lambda(Q \cup Q', A, \alpha) < \alpha_\Delta$ also follows from $A \in Q' \vdash P'$. Hence $((P \cap P'), (Q \cup Q')) \in \Omega(\alpha)$.

The analogue, in Hepp's convergence proof [8], of the good set of forests defined by the pair (P, Q) of forests, as above, is the collection of the Hepp trees, $T = (\mathfrak{U}, \mathcal{M}, \sigma)$, defined on page 308 of [8], such that $\mathfrak{U} = Q$, and the set of all the members, A, of

$\mathfrak{U}$, such that $\sigma(A) \leq 0$, is P. It would be interesting to find out whether or not the good sets of forests defined by $\Omega(\alpha)$, as above, in each Hepp sector, bear some relation to the partial sums of counterterms, $\mathcal{F}_T(U)$, which Hepp decomposes the BPHZ-renormalized integrand into, in Lemma 2.4(a) of [8], and whose contributions Hepp bounds, in Lemma 3.2 of [8], although consideration of the first good set of forests, in Fig. 5 of [8], shows that the correspondence cannot be exact. The correspondence with Hepp's terminology, here, is that the members of P are the vertices of the graph, together with Hepp's "twigs", and the members of Q, that are not members of P, are Hepp's "boughs". It would also be interesting to see if a suitable definition of $\Omega(p)$, for momentum space, could be extracted from Zimmermann's proof of convergence in momentum space, [12]. The criterion for a subdiagram to be a "cluster", for given momenta in the lines of the diagram, in Euclidean signature momentum space, would broadly be that the magnitude of the momentum, in each of its internal lines, be larger than the magnitude of the momentum, in any of its legs, but, due to the fact that the R-operation changes the magnitudes of the momenta, in the internal lines of subdiagrams, the precise criterion might need to be chosen carefully, in order to obtain analogues of Lemmas 7, 10, and 11. Zimmermann is able to avoid dividing the momentum space of the diagram into tessellating sectors, because the momentum space power-counting theorem, whose hypotheses he has to satisfy, is expressed in terms of the power-counting behaviour of the integrand, as the loop momenta tend to infinity, within hyperplanes of various dimensions. Thus, on each hyperplane, he can divide up the set of all forests, into good sets of forests, in a manner appropriate for bounding the integrand on that hyperplane, without being concerned about the fact that the hyperplanes intersect one another, and the way he divides up the set of all forests, into good sets of forests, at a given point in the momentum space of the diagram, will in general be different, according to which hyperplane through that point he is considering. The good sets of forests, on a given hyperplane, in Section 4 of [12], are defined by the pairs (B, C), where, in Zimmermann's terminology, C is a complete forest, with respect to that hyperplane, and B is the base of C.

To make practical use of BPHZ renormalization, for physically interesting gauge theories, it is necessary to ensure that the Slavnov-Taylor identities [23, 24, 25], which are the quantum form of the BRST invariance [26, 27] of the properly gauge-fixed classical action, are preserved. The BRST invariance of the gauge-fixed classical action implies, if the effects of renormalization are ignored, that the vacuum expectation values of BRST-invariant quantities, hence of gauge-invariant quantities, are independent of the choice of the gauge-fixing term in the action. This follows from the fact that, in the standard framework of Fadeev and Popov [28, 29, 30] and 't Hooft [31], the sum of the gauge-fixing and Faddeev-Popov terms in the gauge-fixed action is a BRST variation, and, if the effects of renormalization are ignored, vacuum expectation values of BRST-invariant quantities are unaltered by the addition of a BRST variation to the action. Indeed, in the example of Yang-Mills theory, if we implement the gauge fixing by Nakanishi-Lautrup auxiliary fields B_a, (which simply become Lagrange multipliers, in gauges such as Landau gauge and radiation gauge, where the gauge-fixing parameter α vanishes), we can write the BRST variation as:

$$\delta_{\mathrm{BRST}} = \int d^d x \left((D_\mu \phi)_{ax} \frac{\delta}{\delta A_{\mu a x}} - \frac{1}{2} f_{abc} \phi_{bx} \phi_{cx} \frac{\delta}{\delta \phi_{ax}} + i B_{ax} \frac{\delta}{\delta \psi_{ax}} \right)$$

which is nilpotent identically, $(\delta_{\mathrm{BRST}})^2 = 0$, and independent of the form of the gauge-fixing term in the action. Here $(D_\mu \phi)_{ax} = \partial_\mu \phi_{ax} + A_{\mu b x} f_{abc} \phi_{cx}$. Then the sum of the gauge-fixing and Fadeev-Popov terms in the action can be written as

$$\frac{1}{g^2} \delta_{\mathrm{BRST}} \left(\psi_a \mathcal{F}_a - i \frac{\alpha}{2} \psi_a B_a \right)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_a$ is the gauge-fixing function, for example $\mathcal{F}_a = \partial_\mu A_{\mu a}$ for covariant gauges, and $\mathcal{F}_a = \partial_i A_{ia}$ for radiation gauge. So in a covariant gauge, we have:

$$\frac{1}{g^2} \left(i B_a \left(\partial_\mu A_{\mu a} \right) + \frac{\alpha}{2} B_a B_a + \psi_a \left(\partial_\mu \left(D_\mu \phi \right)_a \right) \right) = \frac{1}{g^2} \delta_{\mathrm{BRST}} \left(\psi_a \left(\partial_\mu A_{\mu a} \right) - i \frac{\alpha}{2} \psi_a B_a \right)$$

Thus we can interpolate between different choices of gauge-fixing function, and different gauge parameters, by adding different BRST variations to the action. So to demonstrate that vacuum expectation values of BRST-invariant quantities are independent of the choice of the gauge-fixing function and the gauge parameter, it is sufficient to demonstrate that vacuum expectation values, of BRST-invariant quantities, are unaltered by the addition, to the action, of an infinitesimal multiple of a BRST variation. The change of a vacuum expectation value, resulting from the addition of an infinitesimal term to the action, is, in Euclidean signature, equal to the negative of that same vacuum expectation value, with the infinitesimal addition to the action, now included in the pre-exponential factor. Thus the change of the vacuum expectation value of a product of BRST-invariant quantities, say $X, \ldots, Y$, resulting from the addition, to the action, of an infinitesimal multiple, say η, of a BRST variation, say $\delta_{\mathrm{BRST}} Z$, is equal to the vacuum expectation value of a BRST variation, namely

$$-\eta\delta_{\mathrm{BRST}}\left(X\ldots YZ\right)=-\eta X\ldots Y\left(\delta_{\mathrm{BRST}}Z\right)$$

On the other hand, by making an infinitesimal change of variables in the functional integral, $\tilde{A}_{\mu ax}=A_{\mu ax}+\varepsilon\delta_{\mathrm{BRST}}A_{\mu ax}$, $\tilde{\phi}_{ax}=\phi_{ax}+\varepsilon\delta_{\mathrm{BRST}}\phi_{ax}$, $\tilde{\psi}_{ax}=\psi_{ax}+\varepsilon\delta_{\mathrm{BRST}}\psi_{ax}$, and $\tilde{B}_{ax}=B_{ax}+\varepsilon\delta_{\mathrm{BRST}}B_{ax}$, where ε is an infinitesimal anticommuting constant, and using the facts that the value of a functional integral is unaltered by a change of integration variables, the action is BRST invariant, and the Jacobian of this particular change of variables is exactly equal to 1, one finds that the vacuum expectation value, of a BRST variation, is equal to 0. The way in which the effects, of an infinitesimal change in the choice of the gauge-fixing term in the action, cancel among groups of Feynman diagrams contributing to the vacuum expectation value of a physical quantity, if the effects of renormalization are ignored, was demonstrated, for Yang-Mills theory, by Mills [32]. Conversely, if the effects of renormalization violate BRST invariance, or, in other words, violate the Slavnov-Taylor identities, the vacuum expectation values of physical quantities will usually not be independent of the choice of the gauge-fixing term in the action, which means that the predictions of the theory will fail to be Lorentz-covariant, if the calculations are done in a physical gauge, such as radiation gauge, or the theory will have negative-norm states, whose effects do not cancel out, if the calculations are done in a Lorentz-covariant gauge. The proof of the cancellation of the effects of negative-norm states, in a Lorentz-covariant gauge, is usually called a unitarity proof, because it implies that the S-matrix, restricted to the physical states, is unitary. The unitarity proofs of 't Hooft for renormalized Yang-Mills theory [31], and of Sterman, Townsend, and van Nieuwenhuizen for renormalized supergravity [33], explicitly use only linear identities, called Ward-Takahashi identities [34, 35], that depend only on the linear terms in the BRST variation, but the argument assumes the validity of the full nonlinear Slavnov-Taylor identities, that correspond to the full non-linear BRST variation.

The BPHZ-renormalized Feynman diagrams generally violate the Slavnov-Taylor identities, but, in consequence of the convergence proof, the violation is by a finite amount. It is therefore necessary to seek, at each successive order in the loop expansion, (i.e. the expansion in powers of $\hbar$), additional finite local counterterms, which, when added to the action, restore the validity of the Slavnov-Taylor identities. If no such finite local counterterm exists, the theory is said to have a gauge "anomaly" [36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56], which results in the shortcomings mentioned above. The possible anomalies are constrained by the Wess-Zumino consistency condition [57, 58, 59, 60], which has led to the complete classification of the possible anomalies, in some types of gauge theories [61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68]. An explicit example of a finite counterterm, that restores a Ward-Takahashi identity for a gauge-field propagator in an Abelian gauge theory, when the position-space integral, in the counterterm, is cut off at large distances, is given in Section 5.4.1 of [14], although the detailed form of the long-distance cutoff, in that example, is different from that considered in the present paper.

The Slavnov-Taylor identities relate vacuum expectation values (VEVs) or correlation functions that involve not only the fields themselves, but also, certain products of the fields at coincident points in position space, namely the products that occur in the non-linear terms in the BRST variations of the fields. This is necessary in order to have a set of VEVs or correlation functions that is closed under the BRST variations. Fortunately, the BRST transformation is nilpotent, when Nakanishi-Lautrup auxiliary fields are used for the gauge-fixing, or, otherwise, when the antighost field equation is used, so the required set of field products is limited to the BRST variations of the fields. The products of fields, at coincident points in position space, are defined to be Zimmermann normal products [69, 70, 71]. VEVs and correlation functions involving normal products are defined by BPHZ renormalization, just as if the normal product vertices in a diagram were additional vertices in the action, even though their positions are not integrated over. It is therefore natural to introduce position-dependent "sources" for the normal products, and add the normal products, multiplied by their "sources", to the action. The Slavnov-Taylor identities take a very compact form, when such "sources" are introduced for the BRST variations of the fields, and it is this compact form of the Slavnov-Taylor identities, for the action that has had the BRST variations of the fields, multiplied by the "sources" for the BRST variations, added to it, that is required to be preserved by renormalization, since this allows for the fact that the BRST variations also get infinite correction terms, due to the BPHZ definition of VEVs and correlation functions involving normal products, and allows finite counterterms dependent on the "sources" for the BRST variations, as well as the finite counterterms independent of these "sources", to be added to the action, order by order in the loop expansion, in order to restore the validity of the Slavnov-Taylor identities.

The study of the Slavnov-Taylor identities makes use of a number of relations, sometimes called quantum action principles [72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77], that involve not only normal products, but also, slight generalizations, called oversubtracted normal products, and anisotropic normal products. An oversubtracted normal product is a normal product, X, that is assigned an integer, n, greater than the dimension of X, that is to be used, instead of the dimension of X, in determining the maximum degree of the Taylor expansion, of the BPHZ counterterm, for any subdiagram that includes X. The dimension of a monomial in the fields and derivatives, here, means the number of derivatives, plus, for each field, half the dimension, at short distances, of the corresponding propagator, which is $\frac{(d-2)}{2}$ for a propagating boson, and $\frac{(d-1)}{2}$ for a propagating fermion, in d dimensions. An anisotropic normal product is a normal product that is assigned two or more different degrees of oversubtraction, depending on which legs of the normal product are internal lines, and which are external lines, of a subdiagram that includes the normal product. The oversubtracted and anisotropic normal products are related to the ordinary normal products by linear relations, called Zimmermann identities [69, 70, 71], which state, for example, that the difference between an oversubtracted normal product, and the corresponding ordinary normal product, is equal to a linear combination, with coefficients that vanish, at zeroth order in perturbation theory, of normal products, of dimension less than or equal to the integer, n, that is assigned to the oversubtracted normal product, as above. Both the quantum action principles, and the Zimmermann identities, might need to be modified, when the propagators, in the counterterms, are allowed to differ, at large distances, from the propagators in the direct terms, as allowed by the convergence proofs, in the present paper.

In general, the additional finite counterterms, that are allowed to be added to the Lagrangian, at a given order in the loop expansion, or, in other words, at a given order in the expansion in powers of $\hbar$, are the most general linear combinations of local monomials in the fields and their derivatives, of dimension not exceeding the maximum dimension of the BPHZ counterterms that occur at that order in the loop expansion, and which preserve the subgroup of the full Poincaré group preserved by the tree level Lagrangian, and the global internal symmetries of the tree level Lagrangian. Thus, in Lorentz-covariant gauges, the counterterms are required to be Lorentz-invariant, while in gauges such as radiation gauge, where some terms in the tree-level Lagrangian depend on a special direction, defined by a unit vector, n_μ, the counterterms are also allowed to depend on n_μ. The coefficients of the finite counterterms are fixed by requiring, firstly, that the Slavnov-Taylor identities are preserved, then, secondly, any further independent coefficients, whose values affect the physical predictions of the theory, are fixed, by fitting the predictions of the theory, to a finite number of experimental measurements, then, finally, the remaining independent coefficients, whose values do not affect the physical predictions of the theory, are fixed, by choosing a finite number of normalization conditions on the correlation functions or proper vertices, which serve to stabilize the gauge in which the calculations are being done. If, after the Slavnov-Taylor identities have been preserved, the number of independent coefficients, whose values affect the physical predictions of the theory, does not increase with increasing order in the loop expansion, the theory is said to be renormalizable, and makes definite predictions, with no scope for adjustment, for the rates of physical processes, once the values of the relevant coefficients have been determined, by fitting the results of a finite, fixed set of experimental measurements. An example of a renormalizable theory is the Standard Model [78] in $3+1$ space-time dimensions, in which case the relevant coefficients correspond to the masses, mixing angles, and coupling constants in the tree-level Lagrangian, whereas gravity and supergravity [79, 80] in $3+1$ dimensions, and Yang-Mills theory in more than 4 dimensions, are not renormalizable.

By making use of the quantum action principles, the Zimmermann identities, and the Wess-Zumino consistency condition, Becchi, Rouet, and Stora [81, 82] explicitly demonstrated, for the Abelian Higgs-Kibble model [83, 84, 85], and the SU(2) Higgs-Kibble model [86, 87], in which all particles are massive, and the Adler-Bell-Jackiw anomaly [38, 39] is absent, that the Slavnov-Taylor identities could be preserved, to all orders in the loop expansion, by suitable choices of the additional finite counterterms, and that when the Slavnov-Taylor identities are preserved, the physical S-matrix is unitary, in a class of Lorentz-covariant gauges, and is independent of the normalization conditions imposed on the BPHZ-renormalized proper vertices, that correspond to a specification of the choice of gauge, within the class of Lorentz-covariant gauges considered. The practical techniques that have been developed, for the explicit calculation of the additional finite counterterms, that restore the validity of the Slavnov-Taylor identities, order by order in the loop expansion, are sometimes referred to as algebraic renormalization [88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 22].

For Yang-Mills theories, a theorem of Joglekar and Lee [99, 100] states that a general BRST-invariant local polynomial, in the fields and their derivatives, of Fadeev-Popov ghost number zero, is equal to the sum of a gauge-invariant polynomial in the field strengths $F^a_{\mu\nu}$ and their gauge-covariant derivatives, and a BRST variation. If an analogous result also held for other gauge theories, then the non-discrete physically significant adjustable parameters of the BPHZ renormalized theory, which remain undetermined, at a given order in the loop expansion, after satisfying the Slavnov-Taylor identities at that order, and thus have to be fitted to experiment, reducing the predictiveness of the theory, would be in one-to-one correspondence with the non-trivial adjustable parameters of the corresponding (on-shell) gauge-invariant classical action, allowing terms with higher derivatives, up to and including the maximum number of derivatives required, in the BPHZ counterterms, at that order in the loop expansion. "Non-trivial", here, means that the coefficients of higher-derivative terms that vanish when the field equations of the zero-loop theory are satisfied, are not counted, because, for small values of their coefficients, those terms can be absorbed by a redefinition of the fields. Coefficients of total derivative terms are also not counted. Thus, in particular, pure Einstein gravity, in $3+1$ dimensions, gets no new adjustable physical parameters at one loop order, because $\sqrt{-g}R^2$ and $\sqrt{-g}R^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu}$ vanish when the vacuum Einstein equations are satisfied, and $\sqrt{-g}(R^2 - 4R^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu} + R^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta})$ is a total derivative [101, 102]. "(On-shell) gauge-invariant" means that, for gauge transformations such as the local supersymmetry variations of supergravity without auxiliary fields [103], whose commutator includes a trivial gauge transformation, as defined in Section 2.4 of [104], the gauge variations of the higher derivative terms are only required to vanish when the field equations that follow from the zero-loop action are satisfied, because, for small values of the coefficients of the higher derivative terms, their gauge variations can, in that case, be cancelled, by the addition of appropriate additional terms to the gauge transformation rules. It might be interesting to look at supergravity in eleven dimensions [105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112], and Hořava-Witten theory [113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121], from this point of view.

The compact form of the Slavnov-Taylor identities, for the action that has had the BRST variations of the fields, multiplied by the "sources" for the BRST variations, added to it, is sometimes called the Zinn-Justin equation [122], when it is expressed in terms of the generating functional of the proper vertices, defined in the standard way, by the application of a Legendre transformation, with respect to the fields and their sources, to the generating functional of the connected Green functions. The Legendre transformation does not affect the "sources" for the BRST variations, which are treated, in effect, like position-dependent "coupling constants", that may also have

Lorentz and Yang-Mills indices. The zero-loop form of the Zinn-Justin equation is called the Batalin-Vilkovisky master equation [123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137], and is thought to provide a comprehensive framework for studying the gauge-fixing of gauge theories, at the zero-loop order. In this context, the "sources", for the BRST variations of the fields, are usually called "antifields". An alternative framework for the BPHZ renormalization of gauge theories, that appears to focus on the quantum-corrected Batalin-Vilkovisky master equation, written in terms of Zimmermann normal products, rather than on the Slavnov-Taylor identities, has been proposed by De Jonghe, París, and Troost[138]. A formal proof, that the quantum-corrected Batalin-Vilkovisky master equation implies that physical quantities are independent of the choice of the gauge-fixing terms in the action, was given by Fuster, Henneaux, and Maas [137].

The definition of the BPHZ counterterms, in position space, depends on the choice of the contraction weights, ω_{AB}, as defined on page 31, where A and B are subdiagrams of a Feynman diagram, such that B is a subdiagram of A. However, when the action is translation-invariant, the change to a counterterm, that results from a change of the contraction weights, vanishes when the degree of divergence is zero, and is a total divergence, when the degree of divergence is greater than zero. Indeed, for a subdiagram, A, with n vertices, and a set of contraction weights, ω, let $\lambda_i \equiv \omega_{A\{i\}}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, where i runs over the vertices of A. Then $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i = 1$, and a typical overall counterterm, for A, has the form:

$$C_A(z)\big|_\lambda =$$

$$= \int d^{nd}x\,\delta^d\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\lambda_i x_i - z\right) I(x) \sum_{r=0}^{N}\frac{1}{r!}\left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m}(\bar{x}_j - z)\,.\hat{y}_j\right)^r E(y_1,\ldots,y_m)\right)_{y_1=\ldots=y_m=z}$$

Here $I(x) = I(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$, the internal function of A, includes the internal propagators of A, which may differ, at long distances, in the counterterm, from the corresponding propagators in the direct term, as allowed by the convergence proofs in this paper. $I(x)$ may also include BPHZ counterterms for strict subdiagrams of A. Translation invariance means that, for arbitrary u, $I(x_1+u,\ldots,x_n+u) = I(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$. N is the degree of divergence. m is the number of legs of A, which is the number of fields, in the corresponding formal counterterm, in the Lagrangian. $\bar{x}_j$ is the position of the inner end of the jth leg of A, *before* the contraction of A. If none of the subdiagrams of A have been contracted, then each $\bar{x}_j$ will simply be one of the x_i, while if some of the subdiagrams of A have been contracted, some of the $\bar{x}_j$ might be linear combinations of some of the x_i, with total weight 1. $\hat{y}_{j\mu}$ means $\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{j\mu}}$, where μ is the Lorentz index. $E\left(y_1,\ldots,y_m\right)$ is the external function of A. In the Feynman diagram, $y_1,\ldots,y_m$ are the positions of the ends, in A, of the propagators that form the legs of A, and are thus evaluated at $\bar{x}_1,\ldots,\bar{x}_m$, before the contraction of A, and at $z,\ldots,z$, where $z=\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i$, after the contraction of A. In the Feynman diagram, $E\left(y_1,\ldots,y_m\right)$ also depends, implicitly, on the positions of the external vertices of the diagram, and, also, on the positions of any vertices of the diagram, not in A, that have not yet been integrated over. In the counterterm, on the other hand, $E\left(y_1,\ldots,y_m\right)$ is the product of some fields, $\varphi_1\left(y_1\right)\ldots\varphi_m\left(y_m\right)$, all of which are evaluated at z, after the differentiations have been performed.

Let ω' be another set of contraction weights, and let $\lambda'_i\equiv\omega'_{A\{i\}}$, $1\leq i\leq n$, so that $\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda'_i=1$. Let $x'_i=x_i+\sum_{k=1}^n\left(\lambda'_k-\lambda_k\right)x_k$, $1\leq i\leq n$. Hence $\frac{\partial x'_i}{\partial x_j}=\delta_{ij}+\lambda'_j-\lambda_j$, which has determinant equal to 1. Furthermore, $\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda_i x'_i=\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda'_i x_i$, and $\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda'_i x'_i=\sum_{i=1}^n\left(2\lambda'_i-\lambda_i\right)x_i$, hence $x_i=x'_i+\sum_{k=1}^n\left(\lambda_k-\lambda'_k\right)x'_k$. Hence the above counterterm, evaluated with the contraction weights ω', is:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&C_A\left(z\right)\big|_{\lambda'}=\\
&=\int d^{nd}x\,\delta^d\left(\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda'_i x_i-z\right)I\left(x\right)\sum_{r=0}^N\frac{1}{r!}\left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^m\left(\bar{x}_j-z\right).\hat{y}_j\right)^r E\left(y_1,\ldots,y_m\right)\right)_{y_1=\ldots=y_m=z}=\\
&=\int d^{nd}x'\,\delta^d\left(\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda_i x'_i-z\right)I\left(x'\right)\sum_{r=0}^N\frac{1}{r!}\left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^m\left(\bar{x}'_j+\left(\sum_{k=1}^n\left(\lambda_k-\lambda'_k\right)x'_k\right)-z\right).\hat{y}_j\right)^r\times\right.\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\left.\times E\left(y_1,\ldots,y_m\right)\right)_{y_1=\ldots=y_m=z}
\end{aligned}
$$

where I used the translation invariance of $I\left(x\right)$, and the fact that, since each $\bar{x}_j$ is a linear combination, of total weight 1, of the x_i, we have $\bar{x}_j=\bar{x}'_j+\sum_{k=1}^n\left(\lambda_k-\lambda'_k\right)x'_k$, for all $1\leq j\leq m$.

Hence, renaming x'_i as x_i, we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&C_A\left(z\right)\big|_{\lambda'}-C_A\left(z\right)\big|_{\lambda}=\\
&=\int d^{nd}x\,\delta^d\left(\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda_i x_i-z\right)I\left(x\right)\sum_{r=0}^N\frac{1}{r!}\left(\left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^m\left(\bar{x}_j+\left(\sum_{k=1}^n\left(\lambda_k-\lambda'_k\right)x_k\right)-z\right).\hat{y}_j\right)^r\right.\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
- \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \left(\bar{x}_j - z \right) . \hat{y}_j \right)^{r} \Bigg) E \left(y_1, \ldots, y_m \right) \Bigg)_{y_1 = \ldots = y_m = z} =
$$

$$
= \int d^{nd} x \delta^d \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i x_i - z \right) I \left(x \right) \left(\sum_{s=1}^{N} \frac{1}{s!} \left(\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(\lambda_k - \lambda'_k \right) x_k \right) . \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \hat{y}_j \right) \right)^{s} \times \right.
$$

$$
\left. \times \sum_{t=0}^{N-s} \frac{1}{t!} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \left(\bar{x}_j - z \right) . \hat{y}_j \right)^{t} E \left(y_1, \ldots, y_m \right) \right)_{y_1 = \ldots = y_m = z} =
$$

$$
= \int d^{nd} x \delta^d \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i x_i \right) I \left(x \right) \left(\sum_{s=1}^{N} \frac{1}{s!} \left(\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(\lambda_k - \lambda'_k \right) x_k \right) . \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \hat{y}_j \right) \right)^{s} \times \right.
$$

$$
\left. \times \sum_{t=0}^{N-s} \frac{1}{t!} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \bar{x}_j . \hat{y}_j \right)^{t} E \left(y_1, \ldots, y_m \right) \right)_{y_1 = \ldots = y_m = z} =
$$

$$
= \sum_{s=1}^{N} \frac{1}{s!} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{\mu_1}} \ldots \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{\mu_s}} \left(\int d^{nd} x \delta^d \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i x_i \right) I \left(x \right) \times \right.
$$

$$
\times \left(\sum_{k_1=1}^{n} \left(\lambda_{k_1} - \lambda'_{k_1} \right) x_{k_1 \mu_1} \right) \ldots \left(\sum_{k_s=1}^{n} \left(\lambda_{k_s} - \lambda'_{k_s} \right) x_{k_s \mu_s} \right) \times
$$

$$
\left. \times \left(\sum_{t=0}^{N-s} \frac{1}{t!} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \bar{x}_j . \hat{y}_j \right)^{t} E \left(y_1, \ldots, y_m \right) \right)_{y_1 = \ldots = y_m = z} \right)
$$

where the second-last step resulted from shifting all the x_i by z, and using the translation invariance of $I \left(x \right)$, again.

More generally, a change, to the contraction weights, will result in a change to the finite counterterms that need to be added, in order to satisfy the Slavnov-Taylor identities. The convergence proofs, in the present paper, are given for an arbitrary, fixed set of contraction weights, that satisfies conditions (i), (ii), and (iii), on page 31. These conditions allow a substantial amount of flexibility in the choice of the contraction weights, as discussed on pages 31 and 32.

For the application of the results to the Group-Variation Equations [14], the renormalization of the gauge-invariant quantities, in terms of which the Group-Variation Equations are expressed, is also required. It was originally intended that these would be the VEVs and correlation functions of generalized Wilson loops formed from paths consisting of finite numbers of straight line segments. However, these have rather complicated properties under renormalization, with infinities depending on the angles made by the straight line segments, at the vertices where they meet, and further singularities appearing whenever the vertices are positioned such that two of the straight line segments intersect. The intention was to divide these VEVs and correlation functions by "short distance factors", consisting of the same VEVs and correlation functions, but calculated with propagators smoothly cut off at long distances, and then to rewrite the Group-Variation Equations as equations for these ratios, the "long-distance factors", which would not be sensitive to the fine details of the paths. It now seems likely, however, that this program could be carried out in a more practical manner, by using, as the basic gauge-invariant quantities, not the generalized Wilson loops formed from paths consisting of finite numbers of straight line segments, but rather, the "point-pinned loops", formed from the same sequences of points in four-dimensional Euclidean space, as the corners of the paths, but having, between each successive pair of path vertices, not the straight Wilson line between the two vertices, but rather, a factor

$$\left(e^{s\mathcal{D}^2}\right)_{xi,y\bar{j}} =$$

$$= \left(e^{s\partial^2}\right)_{xy}\delta_{i\bar{j}} + \int_0^s du \int d^4z \left(e^{u\partial^2}\right)_{xz}\left(A_{i\bar{j}}\left(z\right).\partial_z + \partial_z.A_{i\bar{j}}\left(z\right)\right)\left(e^{(s-u)\partial^2}\right)_{zy} + \ldots$$

where $\mathcal{D}_\mu$ is covariant derivative for a scalar field in the SU(n) fundamental, x and y are the positions of the two vertices, and i and $\bar{j}$ are the colour indices, to be traced along the loop as usual. The idea is that, for small enough real s, the paths from x to y, that appear in the sum over paths, in the path integral representation of the above factor, will be strongly suppressed by the standard Gaussian factors,

$$\left(e^{(u_{n+1}-u_n)\partial^2}\right)_{z_n z_{n+1}} = \frac{e^{-\frac{\left(z_{n+1}-z_n\right)^2}{4\left(u_{n+1}-u_n\right)}}}{\left(4\pi\left(u_{n+1}-u_n\right)\right)^2},$$

for paths that wander significantly away from the straight line from x to y. In that case, the pointed-pinned loop, with a suitably small s_i for each segment, will have approximately the same long-distance factor as the generalized Wilson loop formed from the corresponding straight line segments. On the other hand, it seems reasonable to anticipate that the point-pinned loops might have much simpler properties, under renormalization, then the corresponding generalized Wilson loops, formed from the corresponding straight line segments. The simplest guess would be that a point-pinned loop needs only two divergent "wave-function renormalization" factors, when all the vertices are at different positions in four-dimensional Euclidean space: a fixed divergent factor, N, for each vertex, and a factor $e^{-m^2 s_i}$ for each segment, with a fixed divergent "mass", m.

It seems possible, that the technique of allowing the propagators in the counterterms to differ, at long distances, from the propagators in the direct terms, might also be implemented in Hepp's method, by introducing an appropriate upper limit to the parameter integrals, for the propagators in the counterterms, and checking to see if this caused any problems in Hepp's convergence proof. Similarly, it seems possible that the long-distance cutoffs on the propagators, introduced to define the short-distance factors in the Group-Variation equations, could also be introduced, in Hepp's method, by means of an appropriate upper limit to the parameter integrals. Furthermore, to the extent that position-dependent background fields, coupling to composite operators, have to be introduced, for example for the purpose of studying the Slavnov-Taylor identities, or for calculations in position-dependent gravitational backgrounds, it seems possible that a smooth position-dependence of the backgrounds might be dealt with in Hepp's method, by introducing an independent "source", j_μ, or p_μ, in the Gaussian exponent, for each vertex, at which position-dependence of the coupling constant, or the background, is required, doing the Gaussian integrals over the vertex positions in the usual way, then differentiating with respect to the "sources", to bring down the required pre-exponential factors of the vertex positions, before setting the "sources" to zero. In momentum space, the result of doing the Gaussian integrals over the positions of the vertices, in the presence of the "sources", would look like Symanzik's formula [139] [140], with a momentum coming in at every vertex, rather than just at the "external" vertices, of the diagram. Moreover, it appears that a tolerable "Gaussian" representation, with n integration parameters, of the Wilson area law, for the VEV of a loop that approximately follows a loop formed from n straight line segments, can be obtained by a simple improvement of the ansatz discussed in Section 8.1.3 of [14], based on Douglas's formula for the area of a minimal-area spanning surface [141] [142]. Finally, the limiting process proposed in [14], for calculating the path integrals weighted by the window factors, in which the smoothly-varying long-distance factors are only "tied", or "stitched", to the paths, at a finite number of points, and the path sums between the "stitch points", weighted by the short-distance factors, are done exactly, in terms of modified Feynman diagrams, with the limiting process consisting of increasing the number of points at which the long-distance factors are "stitched" to the paths, is also formulated in terms of exponentiated propagators.

Thus, it seems possible, that if the Group-Variation Equations are expressed in terms of the point-pinned loops, instead of generalized Wilson loops formed from straight line segments, and if the area-law ansatz, based on Douglas's formula, can also be extended to an ansatz for the loop correlation functions, so that it gives tolerable results in circumstances where a minimal-area spanning surface, of higher topology, actually exists, then all the ingredients required to calculate the right-hand sides of the Group-Variation Equations, for a realistic ansatz, might actually be available within the Hepp framework of exponentiated propagators, which would, in that case, probably be the method of choice, for practical calculations. Perhaps it might, after all, be possible to study the Group-Variation Equations within the framework of dimensional regularization [143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148].

Thus if the Group-Variation Equations can, in fact, be reformulated in terms of point-pinned loops, in the manner just described, then the original motivation for the present paper, which was the unsuitability of exponentiated propagator and momentum space methods, for the calculation of VEVs and correlation functions of generalized Wilson loops, formed from straight line segments, is largely removed. Perhaps, however, the proof of the possibility of using propagators in the counterterms, which differ, at large distances, from the propagators in the direct terms, so that for theories with massless particles, the long-distance divergences can be eliminated from the counterterms, without altering the propagators in the direct terms, might have some practical utility, and lead to the proof of analogous results, for the parameter space and momentum space methods.

A different method of renormalization, in the absence of translation invariance, was given by Brunetti and Fredenhagen [149], who deal with the case of Minkowski signature, and base their construction on the method of Epstein and Glaser [150]. A proof of the BPHZ renormalizability of $\lambda\phi^4$ field theory, in a Euclidean signature four-dimensional curved gravitational background, was given by Bunch [151].

Remarkable progress towards the analytic solution of SU(N) Yang-Mills theory, at large N, in $2+1$ dimensions, has recently been reported in [152].

Acknowledgement

The following LaTeX2e transcription was produced semi-automatically from the original text, and I would like to thank Malcolm Surl for helping to recover the original data from an obsolete type of floppy disk.

1 Introduction.

Many attempts to make QCD into a quantitative theory for hadrons involve the use of Wilson loops. When a Feynman diagram contributing to a Wilson loop expectation value is calculated, some of the vertices of the diagram must be integrated along the loop. It is desirable to be able to carry out the calculation of the such a diagram directly in position space, and in particular it is desirable to understand in as much detail as possible how the cancellation of short-distance divergences, when the diagram is renormalized, works in position space. In an earlier paper, "Cluster Convergence Theorem", we presented a power-counting convergence theorem for use in Euclidean position space, and in this paper we use the Cluster Convergence Theorem to present a BPHZ convergence proof directly in Euclidean position space.

In Section 6 of this paper we prove, as Theorem 1, the absolute convergence, in Euclidean position space, of renormalized diagrams when the BPHZ forests are allowed to include *all* connected subdiagrams, (both one-line-reducible and one-line-irreducible), that are divergent by power-counting.

In Section 7 of this paper we prove, as Theorem 2, the convergence, not necessarily absolute, in Euclidean position space, of renormalized diagrams when the BPHZ forests are only allowed to include one-line-irreducible subdiagrams. In this case we give the result both in a form that involves taking a limit from regularized propagators, and in a form that makes no use of regularized propagators.

Our methods enable any renormalized Feynman diagram to be calculated directly in Euclidean position space, without any use of momentum space or Gaussian integral techniques.

In Section 8, "Applications", we explain the derivation of our formula for the renormalized integrand, and we show that for QCD, our form of the R-operation requires no counterterms whose total number of gauge fields plus derivatives plus $\frac{3}{2}$ times quark fields is greater than 4, so that power-counting renormalizability is achieved.

For Theorem 1 we make no assumption of translation invariance, nor of any related property, and for Theorem 2 we assume not translation invariance but a much more general property of translation smoothness.

2 Preparations.

Let A and B be any sets. We shall use the convention that the notation $A \subseteq B$ means "A is a subset of B", and includes the possibility that $A = B$. We shall write $A \subset B$, and say "A is a strict subset of B", to indicate that A is a subset of B but not equal to B. The notation $A \vdash B$ ("A outside B") means the set of all the members of A that are *not* members of B.

The word "ifif" is short for "if and only if".

For any finite set A, the notation $\#(A)$ indicates the number of members of A. If n is an integer ≥ 0, an *n-member set* is a finite set A such that $\#(A) = n$.

The symbol $\emptyset$ denotes the empty set.

For any set X such that every member of X is an ordered pair, we define $\mathcal{D}(X)$, the *domain* of X, to be the set of all the first components of members of X, and $\mathcal{R}(X)$, the *range* of X, to be the set of all the second components of members of X.

A *map* is a set M whose members are all ordered pairs and which satisfies the requirement that if $(a, b) \in M$ and $(e, f) \in M$ then $a = e$ implies $b = f$.

Note that if M is a *map*, then $\mathcal{D}(M)$ is finite ifif M is finite and that if M is finite then $\#(\mathcal{D}(M)) = \#(M)$ and $\#(\mathcal{R}(M)) \leq \#(M)$.

If M is a map and i is a member of $\mathcal{D}(M)$ then the notation M_i denotes the second component of the unique member of M whose first component is i.

When a subscript appears on a subscript, for example x_{A_α}, the interpretation is *always* $x_{(A_\alpha)}$, *never* $(x_A)_\alpha$.

An expression such as $x_{A\alpha}$, where two subscripts appear side by side, can arise either as an abbreviation of $x_{(A,\alpha)}$, (which arises when the ordered pair (A, α) is a member of the domain of the map x), or as an abbreviation of $(x_A)_\alpha$, (which arises when the member x_A of the range of the map x, is itself a map).

For any sets A and B, we shall denote by B^A the set whose members are all the maps whose domain is A and whose range is a subset of B.

A *bijection* is a map M such that if $(a, b) \in M$ and $(e, f) \in M$ then $b = f$ implies $a = e$.

For any ordered pair (M, A) of a map M and a set A, we define $\downarrow (M, A)$, the *restriction of M to the domain $\mathcal{D}(M) \cap A$*, to be the subset of M whose members are all the members (a, b) of M such that $a \in A$ holds. Thus $\downarrow (M, A)$ is a map whose domain is $\mathcal{D}(M) \cap A$.

For any set F whose members are all themselves sets we define $\mathcal{U}(F)$ to be the union of all the members of F.

For any *nonempty* set F such that every member of F is a set, we define $\mathcal{I}(F)$ to be the intersection of all the members of F.

A *partition* is a set F such that every member of F is a set, no member of F is empty, and for every two distinct members A and B of F, $A \cap B = \emptyset$ holds. And if A is any set, then a *partition of* A is a partition F such that $\mathcal{U}(F) = A$.

For any partition V we define $\Xi(V)$ to be the set whose members are all the *nonempty* subsets A of $\mathcal{U}(V)$ such that if B is any member of V, then either $B \subseteq A$ holds or $B \cap A$ is empty. We note that if V is any partition, and we define a map M whose domain is the set of all the nonempty subsets of V by specifying that for each nonempty subset X of V, $M_X \equiv \mathcal{U}(X)$, then M is a bijection whose domain is the set of all the nonempty subsets of V and whose range is $\Xi(V)$. Thus if V is a finite set, then $\Xi(V)$ is a finite set and $\#(\Xi(V)) = 2^{\#(V)} - 1$.

If F is a set such that every member of F is a set, then we define $\mathcal{M}(F)$ to be the set whose members are all the members A of F such that there is *no* member B of F such that $B \subset A$ holds, and we define $\mathbb{B}(F) \equiv (F \vdash \mathcal{M}(F))$.

For any ordered pair (F, i) of a set F such that every member of F is a set, and a member i of $\mathcal{U}(F)$, we define $\mathcal{C}(F, i)$ to be the intersection of all the members A of F such that $i \in A$ holds, and we note that $i \in \mathcal{C}(F, i)$ always holds, and that if F is a partition, then $\mathcal{C}(F, i)$ is equal to the unique member of F that has i as a member.

For any ordered pair (F, A) of a set F such that every member of F is a set, and a set A, we define $\mathcal{P}(F, A)$ to be the set whose members are all the members B of F such that $B \subset A$ holds and there is *no* member C of F such that $B \subset C \subset A$ holds.

A *wood* is a set F such that every member of F is a set, no member of F is empty, $\mathcal{U}(F)$ is *finite*, every member of $\mathcal{U}(F)$ is a member of some member of $\mathcal{M}(F)$, $\#(\mathcal{M}(F)) \geq 2$ holds, and for every two distinct members A and B of F, at least one of $A \vdash B$ and $A \cap B$ and $B \vdash A$ is empty.

We note that if F is any wood and A and B are any members of F, then exactly one of the four possibilities $A = B$, $A \subset B$, $B \subset A$, and $A \cap B = \emptyset$ holds. Thus if F is a wood and A and B are any members of $\mathcal{M}(F)$, then either $A = B$ holds or $A \cap B = \emptyset$ holds. Hence $\mathcal{M}(F)$ is a partition. And furthermore, by the definition of a wood, *every* member of $\mathcal{U}(F)$ is a member of some member of $\mathcal{M}(F)$, hence $\mathcal{M}(F)$ is a partition of $\mathcal{U}(F)$.

And we note furthermore that if F is a wood and i is any member of $\mathcal{U}(F)$, then $\mathcal{C}(F, i)$, which by definition is the intersection of all the members of F that have i as a member, is equal to the unique member of $\mathcal{M}(F)$ that has i as a member.

If V is any partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, then a *wood of* V is a wood F such that $\mathcal{M}(F) = V$ holds.

We note that if V is any partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, then V is itself a wood of V, and furthermore if F is any wood of V, then $V \subseteq F$ holds.

If A and B are any sets, then we shall say that "A overlaps B" ifif *none* of $A \vdash B$, $A \cap B$ and $B \vdash A$ is empty. In other words, A overlaps B ifif *none* of $A \subseteq B$, $A \cap B = \emptyset$, and $B \subseteq A$ are true.

Let V be any partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, and let F and G be any woods of V. Then we may verify directly from the definition of a wood of V, that $F \cap G$ is also a wood of V.

Furthermore, let V be any partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, and let F and G be any woods of V such that no member of F overlaps any member of G. Then we may again verify directly from the definition of a wood of V, that $F \cup G$ is also a wood of V.

We note that it is true in general that if a nonempty set X is *totally-ordered* and $finite$, then X has both a unique maximal, or *largest,* member, and a unique minimal, or *smallest*, member. In particular, if F is a nonempty finite set such that every member of F is itself a set, and for every two distinct members A and B of F, exactly one of $A \subset B$ and $B \subset A$ holds, then there is a unique member Z of F such that $A \subseteq Z$ holds for all members A of F, and there is a unique member Y of F such that $Y \subseteq A$ holds for all members A of F. We shall call Z the *largest* member of F, and Y the *smallest* member of F.

Now if F is a wood, A is a set, and B and C are any two distinct members of $\mathcal{P}(F, A)$, then exactly one of $B \subset C$, $B \cap C = \emptyset$, and $C \subset B$ holds, since both B and C are members of the wood F. But $B \in \mathcal{P}(F, A)$ implies that $B \subset C$ cannot hold, and $C \in \mathcal{P}(F, A)$ implies that $C \subset B$ cannot hold, hence $B \cap C = \emptyset$ must hold. Furthermore, every member of $\mathcal{P}(F, A)$ is a member of F, hence no member of $\mathcal{P}(F, A)$ is empty. Hence $\mathcal{P}(F, A)$ is a partition.

Now let B be any member of F such that $B \subset A$ holds, and let X be the set whose members are all the members C of F such that $B \subseteq C$ and $C \subset A$ both hold. Then $B \in X$ holds, hence X is nonempty. Furthermore, if C and D are any two distinct members of X, then $B \subseteq (C \cap D)$ holds, hence $C \cap D$ is nonempty, hence exactly one of $C \subset D$ and $D \subset C$ holds. Hence X has a unique member E such that $C \subseteq E$ holds for all members C of X. Now $E \subset A$ holds by the definition of X, and furthermore, if K is a member of F such that $E \subset K$ and $K \subset A$ both hold, then K would be a member of X such that $E \subset K$ holds, contradicting the fact that $C \subseteq E$ holds for all members C of X. Hence there is no member K of F such that $E \subset K$ and $K \subset A$ both hold, hence E is a member of $\mathcal{P}(F, A)$. Hence for every member B of F such that $B \subset A$ holds, there is a unique member E of $\mathcal{P}(F, A)$ such that $B \subseteq E$ holds.

Now suppose that A is a member of $(\Xi(\mathcal{M}(F)) \vdash \mathcal{M}(F))$, or in other words, suppose that A is any subset of $\mathcal{U}(F)$ such that A neither overlaps any member of $\mathcal{M}(F)$ nor is a subset of any member of $\mathcal{M}(F)$. Let i be any member of A. Then i is a member of $\mathcal{U}(F)$ hence by the definition of a wood, the set $\mathcal{C}(F, i)$ is a member of $\mathcal{M}(F)$ hence, since A neither overlaps any member of $\mathcal{M}(F)$ nor is a subset of any member of $\mathcal{M}(F)$, $\mathcal{C}(F, i) \subset A$ holds. Hence by the preceding paragraph there is a unique member E of $\mathcal{P}(F, A)$ such that $\mathcal{C}(F, i) \subseteq E$ holds, hence there is a member E of $\mathcal{P}(F, A)$ such that $i \in E$ holds. Hence $\mathcal{P}(F, A)$ is a partition such that every member of $\mathcal{P}(F, A)$ is a strict subset of A, and if i is any member of A then there exists a member E of $\mathcal{P}(F, A)$ such that $i \in E$ holds. Hence $\mathcal{P}(F, A)$ is a partition of A such that $\#(\mathcal{P}(F, A)) \geq 2$ holds.

For any wood F, we define the wood $\bar{F}$ by $\bar{F} \equiv F \cup \{\mathcal{U}(F)\}$.

For any ordered pair (F, B) of a wood F and a *nonempty* set B, we define $\mathcal{Y}(F, B)$ to be the *smallest* member A of F such that $B \subseteq A$ holds, if any members A of F exist such that $B \subseteq A$ holds, and to be equal to the empty set $\emptyset$ if there are *no* members A of F such that $B \subseteq A$ holds.

We note that if F is any wood, and B is any member of F such that $B \neq \mathcal{U}(F)$, then $B \in \mathcal{P}\left(F, \mathcal{Y}\left(\left(\bar{F} \vdash \{B\}\right), B\right)\right)$ holds, and furthermore the member $\mathcal{Y}\left(\left(\bar{F} \vdash \{B\}\right), B\right)$ of $\bar{F}$ is the *only* member A of $\bar{F}$ such that $B \in \mathcal{P}(F, A)$ holds. For $\mathcal{Y}\left(\left(\bar{F} \vdash \{B\}\right), B\right)$ is by definition the *smallest* member of $\bar{F}$ to contain B as a *strict* subset. Furthermore, since $\bar{F}$ is equal to F apart from the fact that $\mathcal{U}(F)$ *is* a member of $\bar{F}$, while $\mathcal{U}(F)$ may or may not be a member of F, $\mathcal{P}\left(\bar{F}, A\right)$ is equal to $\mathcal{P}(F, A)$ for every member A of $\bar{F}$. Now $B \subset \mathcal{Y}\left(\left(\bar{F} \vdash \{B\}\right), B\right)$ certainly holds, and moreover there is no member C of F such that $B \subset C \subset \mathcal{Y}\left(\left(\bar{F} \vdash \{B\}\right), B\right)$ holds, for any such member C of F would be a member of $\bar{F}$, since $F \subseteq \bar{F}$ holds, and there is no such member C of $\bar{F}$ since $\mathcal{Y}\left(\left(\bar{F} \vdash \{B\}\right), B\right)$ is the *smallest* member of $\bar{F}$ to contain B as a strict subset.

Hence $B \in \mathcal{P}\left(F, \mathcal{Y}\left(\left(\bar{F} \vdash \{B\}\right), B\right)\right)$ holds. Now let A be any member of $\bar{F}$ such that $B \in \mathcal{P}(F, A)$ holds. Then $B \subset A$ holds and there is *no* member C of F such that $B \subset C \subset A$ holds. Now if there was a member C of $\bar{F}$ such that $B \subset C \subset A$ held then C would be a strict subset of $\mathcal{U}(F)$ hence could not be equal to $\mathcal{U}(F)$, hence C would be a member of F. Hence there is *no* member C of $\bar{F}$ such that $B \subset C \subset A$ holds, hence A is the *smallest* member of $\bar{F}$ to contain B as a strict subset, hence $A = \mathcal{Y}\left(\left(\bar{F} \vdash \{B\}\right), B\right)$ holds.

We note that it follows directly from this that if F is any wood then F is equal to the disjoint union of $\mathcal{P}(F, A)$ for all the members A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{F}\right)$, together with the set $\mathcal{U}(F)$ if $\mathcal{U}(F)$ is a member of F.

We observe that for any wood F, the inequality

$$\#\left(\mathcal{M}(F)\right) \leq \#(F) \leq \left(2\#\left(\mathcal{M}(F)\right) - 1\right)$$

holds. For $\mathcal{M}(F)$ is a subset of F, hence $\#\left(\mathcal{M}(F)\right) \leq \#(F)$ certainly holds, and F is a subset of $\bar{F}$, hence $\#(F) \leq \#\left(\bar{F}\right)$ holds, and moreover $\mathcal{M}\left(\bar{F}\right) = \mathcal{M}(F)$ holds.

Now for each integer $i \geq 2$ let n_i denote the number of members A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{F}\right)$ such that $\#\left(\mathcal{P}(F, A)\right) = i$. Then we count the number of members of $\bar{F}$ in two ways:

(1)
$$\#\left(\bar{F}\right) = \#\left(\mathcal{M}(F)\right) + \sum_{i \geq 2} n_i$$

(2) We note that $\bar{F}$ is equal to the disjoint union of $\mathcal{P}(F, A)$ for all the members A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{F}\right)$, together with the member $\mathcal{U}(F)$ of $\bar{F}$. Hence

$$\#\left(\bar{F}\right) = 1 + \sum_{i \geq 2} i n_i$$

From these two equations we deduce directly that

$$\#\left(\bar{F}\right) = 2\#\left(\mathcal{M}(F)\right) - 1 - \sum_{i \geq 3} (i-2)\, n_i$$

Hence to maximize $\#\left(\bar{F}\right)$ we take n_i as small as possible for all $i \geq 3$, (thus we take $n_i = 0$ for all $i \geq 3$), hence the maximum possible value of $\#\left(\bar{F}\right)$ is $\left(2\#\left(\mathcal{M}(F)\right) - 1\right)$.

For any ordered triple (F, A, i) of a wood F, a member A of $\left(\Xi\left(\mathcal{M}(F)\right) \vdash \mathcal{M}(F)\right)$, and a member i of A we define $\mathcal{K}(F, A, i)$ to be the unique member B of $\mathcal{P}(F, A)$ such that $i \in B$ holds.

For any finite set A we define $\mathcal{Q}(A)$ to be the set whose members are all the two-member subsets of A, and we note that $\#\left(\mathcal{Q}(A)\right) = \frac{1}{2}\#(A)\left(\#(A) - 1\right)$.

For every ordered pair (A, H) of a set A, and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathcal{T}(A, H)$ to be the subset of A whose members are all the members i of A such that there is *no* member B of H such that $i \in B$ and $B \subseteq A$ both hold.

For every ordered pair (F, H) of a wood F, and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathcal{O}(F, H)$ to be the set whose members are all the members i of $\mathcal{U}(F)$ such that there *exists* a member A of F such that $i \in A$ holds and there is *no* member B of H such that $i \in B$ and $B \subseteq A$ both hold.

For every ordered triple (F, H, i) of a wood F, a set H such that every member of H is a set, and a member i of $\mathcal{O}(F, H)$, we define $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ to be the *largest* member A of F such that $i \in A$ holds and there is *no* member B of H such that $i \in B$ and $B \subseteq A$ both hold.

For any sets A and B we define $\mathbb{K}(A, B)$ to be the set whose members are all the sets C such that $A \subseteq C$ and $C \subseteq B$ both hold, and we note that $\mathbb{K}(A, B)$ is equal to the empty set $\emptyset$ if $A \subseteq B$ does *not* hold.

For any ordered triple (F, A, B) of a wood F, a *nonempty* set A, and a set B, we define $\mathbb{Y}(F, A, B)$ to be the set whose members are all the members C of F such that $A \subset C$ and $C \subseteq B$ both hold, and we note that $\mathbb{Y}(F, A, B)$ is equal to the empty set $\emptyset$ if $A \subset B$ does *not* hold.

The symbol $\mathbb{N}$ denotes the set of all the finite integers greater than or equal to zero, the symbol $\mathbb{Z}$ denotes the set of *all* the finite integers, and the symbol $\mathbb{R}$ denotes the set of all the finite real numbers.

If d is an integer ≥ 1, then $\mathbb{E}_d$ denotes d-dimensional Euclidean space.

We define $\mathbb{S}(s)$, for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, by

$$\mathbb{S}(s) \equiv \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } s < 0 \text{ holds} \\ 1 & \text{if } s \geq 0 \text{ holds} \end{cases}$$

And we define $\mathbb{T}(s)$, for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, by

$$\mathbb{T}(s) \equiv \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s < 0 \text{ holds} \\ 0 & \text{if } s \geq 0 \text{ holds} \end{cases}$$

We note that $\mathbb{S}(s) + \mathbb{T}(s) = 1$ holds for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Throughout this paper, a variable with the $\hat{}$ sign above it, indicates the partial derivative with respect to that variable. For example $\hat{y}$ is short for $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}$.

3 Review of the Cluster Convergence Theorem.

A *greenwood* is a wood F such that every member of $\mathcal{M}(F)$ has exactly one member, and if A is any finite set such that $\#(A) \geq 2$ holds, then a *greenwood of* A is a greenwood F such that $\mathcal{U}(F) = A$ holds. We say a greenwood F is *high* ifif $\mathcal{U}(F) \in F$ holds.

If d is an integer ≥ 1, x is a map such that $\mathcal{D}(x)$ is finite, $\#(\mathcal{D}(x)) \geq 2$ holds, and $\mathcal{R}(x)$ is a subset of $\mathbb{E}_d$, and σ is a real number such that $0 < \sigma < 1$ holds, then a σ-*cluster of* x is a nonempty subset A of $\mathcal{D}(x)$ such that either $\#(A) = 1$ holds, or else $|x_i - x_j| < \sigma |x_k - x_m|$ holds for all $i \in A$, $j \in A$, $k \in A$, and $m \in (\mathcal{D}(x) \vdash A)$.

We note that every one-member subset of $\mathcal{D}(x)$ is always a σ-cluster of x, and that $\mathcal{D}(x)$ is always a σ-cluster of x.

We denote the set whose members are all the σ-clusters of x by $\mathcal{F}(x, \sigma)$.

We note that no two σ-clusters of x can overlap. For if A and B are two overlapping subsets of $\mathcal{D}(x)$ then A has a member, say i, that is not a member of B, $(A \cap B)$ has at least one member, say j, and B has at least one member, say k, that is not a member of A. Hence $\#(A) \geq 2$ and $\#(B) \geq 2$. Hence if A is a σ-cluster of x then $|x_i - x_j| < \sigma |x_j - x_k|$, and if B is a σ-cluster of x then $|x_j - x_k| < \sigma |x_i - x_j|$, hence A and B cannot both be σ-clusters of x.

It follows from this that $\mathcal{F}(x, \sigma)$ is a high greenwood of $\mathcal{D}(x)$.

For any ordered triple (x, σ, F) whose first component is a map x such that $\mathcal{D}(x)$ is finite, $\#(\mathcal{D}(x)) \geq 2$, and $\mathcal{R}(x) \subseteq \mathbb{E}_d$, and whose second component is a real number σ such that $0 < \sigma < 1$, and whose third component is a high greenwood F of $\mathcal{D}(x)$, we define the number $\mathcal{A}(x, \sigma, F)$ by

$$\mathcal{A}(x, \sigma, F) \equiv \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 1 & \text{if } \mathcal{F}(x, \sigma) = F \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathcal{F}(x, \sigma) \neq F \end{array} \right\}.$$

For any finite set J such that $\#(J) \geq 2$ holds, we define $\mathbb{H}(J)$ to be the set whose members are all the high greenwoods F of J . Then the following identity holds for all $x \in \mathbb{E}_d^J$ and for all $0 < \sigma < 1$.

$$\sum_{F \in \mathbb{H}(J)} \mathcal{A}(x, \sigma, F) = 1.$$

(We note that $\mathcal{A}(x, \sigma, F)$ is 0 unless $\mathcal{D}(x) \in F$ holds, for $\mathcal{D}(x)$ is always a σ-cluster of x.)

For any ordered pair (x, L) whose first component is a map x such that $\mathcal{D}(x)$ is finite, $\#(\mathcal{D}(x)) \geq 2$, and $\mathcal{R}(x) \subseteq \mathbb{E}_d$, and whose second component is a real number $L \geq 0$, we define the number $\mathcal{B}(x, L)$ by

$$\mathcal{B}(x, L) \equiv \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 1 & \text{if } |x_i - x_j| \leq L \text{ holds for all } i \in \mathcal{D}(x) \text{ and } j \in \mathcal{D}(x) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{array} \right\},$$

and we note that

$$\mathcal{B}(x, L) = \prod_{\Delta \equiv \{i,j\} \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{D}(x))} \mathbb{S}(L - |x_i - x_j|)$$

holds, where $\mathbb{S}(u)$ was defined on page 26, for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$, to be equal to 1 for $u \geq 0$, and equal to 0 otherwise.

If A is a finite set then a *set of powers for* A is a map α such that $\mathcal{Q}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\alpha)$ holds, and for each member Δ of $\mathcal{Q}(A)$, $\alpha_\Delta \in \mathbb{R}$ holds.

For any ordered pair (x, α) whose first component is a map x such that $\mathcal{D}(x)$ is finite, $\#(\mathcal{D}(x)) \geq 2$, and $\mathcal{R}(x) \subseteq \mathbb{E}_d$, and whose second component is a set of powers α for $\mathcal{D}(x)$, we define

$$\Psi(x, \alpha) \equiv \prod_{\Delta \equiv \{i,j\} \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{D}(x))} |x_i - x_j|^{-\alpha_\Delta}.$$

For any ordered pair (α, A) such that A is a finite set and α is a set of powers for A, we define

$$\Gamma(\alpha, A) \equiv \sum_{\Delta \in \mathcal{Q}(A)} \alpha_\Delta.$$

If F is a greenwood and d is an integer ≥ 1, then a *good set of powers for* (F, d) is a set of powers α for $\mathcal{U}(F)$ such that $\Gamma(\alpha, A) < d(\#(A) - 1)$ holds for every member A of $\mathbb{B}(F)$.

The Cluster Convergence Theorem can now be stated as follows:

Let d be any integer ≥ 1, J be any finite set such that $\#(J) \geq 2$, F be any high greenwood of J, α be any good set of powers for (F, d), σ be any real number such that $0 < \sigma < 1$, and L be any real number ≥ 0. Let i be any member of J, z be any member of $\mathbb{E}_d$, and $\mathbb{W}$ be the subset of $\mathbb{E}_d^J$ whose members are all the members x of $\mathbb{E}_d^J$ such that $x_i = z$. Then the integral of $\mathcal{A}(x, \sigma, F)\,\mathcal{B}(x, L)\,\Psi(x, \alpha)$ over $\mathbb{W}$ is finite.

4 Good Sets of Woods.

If A is a set, and U is a set such that every member of U is a set, we shall say that A is *U-connected* ifif for every partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two nonempty parts B and C, there exists a member E of U such that $B \cap E$ and $C \cap E$ are both nonempty.

Lemma 1. Let U be any set such that every member of U is a set, and let X be any *nonempty* set such that every member of X is a U-connected set and $\mathcal{I}(X)$ is nonempty. Then $\mathcal{U}(X)$ is a U-connected set.

Proof. Let $\{J, K\}$ be any partition of $\mathcal{U}(X)$ into two nonempty parts. Now by assumption $\mathcal{I}(X)$ is nonempty. Let i be a member of $\mathcal{I}(X)$. Then i is a member of exactly one member of $\{J, K\}$. Let M be the member of $\{J, K\}$ that has i as a member, and let N be the other member of $\{J, K\}$. Then $M \cap A$ is nonempty for *every* member A of X, (since i is a member of every member of X), and furthermore since N is a nonempty subset of $\mathcal{U}(X)$, there exists at least one member B of X such that $N \cap B$ is nonempty. Let B be a member of X such that $N \cap B$ is nonempty. Then $\{(M \cap B), (N \cap B)\} = \{(J \cap B), (K \cap B)\}$ is a partition of B into two nonempty parts hence, since B is U-connected, there exists a member E of U such that E intersects both $(M \cap B)$ and $(N \cap B)$, or in other words, such that E intersects both $(J \cap B)$ and $(K \cap B)$, hence there exists a member E of U such that E intersects both J and K.

(We note that the example $U = \{\{1,3\}, \{2,3\}, \{1,4\}, \{2,4\}\}$, $X = \{\{1,2,3\}, \{1,2,4\}\}$, shows that $\mathcal{I}(X)$ being nonempty and every member of X being U-connected does *not* imply that $\mathcal{I}(X)$ is U-connected.)

If A is a set and U is a set such that every member of U is a set, then a *U-connected component of* A is a nonempty subset B of A such that B is U-connected and B is *not* a strict subset of any U-connected subset of A.

Lemma 2. Let A be a set, let U be a set such that every member of U is a set, and let F be the set whose members are all the U-connected components of A. Then F is a partition of A.

Proof. We shall first prove that any member i of A is a member of a *unique* U-connected component B of A.

Let i be any member of A, and let X be the set whose members are all the U-connected subsets C of A such that $i \in C$ holds. Then i is a member of $\mathcal{I}(X)$, hence $\mathcal{I}(X)$ is nonempty, hence by Lemma 1, $\mathcal{U}(X)$ is U-connected. And furthermore, $\mathcal{U}(X)$ is *not* a strict subset of any subset C of A such that C is U-connected, for if C is any U-connected subset of A such that $\mathcal{U}(X) \subseteq C$ holds, then C is a U-connected subset of A such that $i \in C$ holds, hence C is a member of X, hence $C \subseteq \mathcal{U}(X)$ holds, hence C is equal to $\mathcal{U}(X)$. Hence $\mathcal{U}(X)$ is a U-connected component of A, hence $\mathcal{U}(X) \in F$ holds.

Furthermore, $\mathcal{U}(X)$ is the *only* member B of F such that $i \in B$ holds. For let B be any member of F such that $i \in B$ holds. Then B is a U-connected subset of A such that $i \in B$ holds, hence $B \in X$ holds, hence B is a subset of $\mathcal{U}(X)$. Furthermore, since B is a U-connected component of A by the definition of F, B cannot be a *strict* subset of the U-connected subset $\mathcal{U}(X)$ of A, hence $B = \mathcal{U}(X)$ holds.

Finally we note that, since every member of F is a subset of A, $\mathcal{U}(F) \subseteq A$ holds, and furthermore, since every member of F is a U-connected component of A, and by definition the empty set $\emptyset$ is *not* a U-connected component of A, the empty set $\emptyset$ is *not* a member of F.

Hence F is a partition of A.

If d is any integer ≥ 1 and x is any map such that $\mathcal{D}(x)$ is finite and $\mathcal{R}(x) \subseteq \mathbb{E}_d$ holds, then by definition $\mathbb{V}(x)$, the *convex hull of* x, is the set of all members y of $\mathbb{E}_d$ such that there exists a member s of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D}(x)}$ such that $s_i \geq 0$ holds for all $i \in \mathcal{D}(x)$, $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}(x)} s_i = 1$ holds, and $y = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}(x)} s_i x_i$ holds.

Lemma 3. Let A be any nonempty finite set, x be any member of $\mathbb{E}_{dA}$, and u and v be any members of the convex hull of x. Then $|u - v| \leq \max\limits_{\substack{i \in A \\ j \in A}} |x_i - x_j|$.

Proof. Let $s \in \mathbb{R}^A$ be such that $s_i \geq 0$ holds for all $i \in A$, $\sum_{i \in A} s_i = 1$, and $u = \sum_{i \in A} s_i x_i$ all hold, and let $t \in \mathbb{R}^A$ be such that $t_j \geq 0$ holds for all $j \in A$, $\sum_{j \in A} t_j = 1$, and $v = \sum_{j \in A} t_j x_j$ all hold. Then

$$|u - v| = \left| \left(\sum_{k \in A} s_k x_k \right) - \left(\sum_{m \in A} t_m x_m \right) \right| = \left| \sum_{\substack{k \in A \\ m \in A}} s_k t_m (x_k - x_m) \right| \leq$$

$$\leq \sum_{\substack{k\in A\\ m\in A}} s_k t_m \left|x_k - x_m\right| \leq \sum_{\substack{k\in A\\ m\in A}} s_k t_m \max_{\substack{i\in A\\ j\in A}} \left|x_i - x_j\right| = \max_{\substack{i\in A\\ j\in A}} \left|x_i - x_j\right|.$$

We observe that if V is any partition, A is any member of $\Xi(V)$, and F is the set whose members are all the members B of V such that $B \subseteq A$ holds, then F is a partition of A. For if i is any member of A, then i is a member of $\mathcal{U}(V)$, hence since V is a partition, there is a unique member B of V such that $i \in B$ holds, and if B is the unique member of V such that $i \in B$ holds, then $B \cap A$ is nonempty since it has the member i, hence by the definition of $\Xi(V)$, $B \subseteq A$ holds, hence $B \in F$ holds, and furthermore, since F is a subset of V, B is the *only* member of F to have i as a member. Hence if i is any member of A, then there is a unique member B of F such that $i \in B$ holds, and furthermore, since every member of F is a subset of A, $\mathcal{U}(F) \subseteq A$ holds, hence F is a partition of A.

We note, furthermore, that if V is any partition, A is any member of $\Xi(V)$, and F is the subset of V whose members are all the members B of V such that $B \subseteq A$ holds, then F is the one-member set $\{A\}$ if A is a member of V, and F is equal to $\mathcal{P}(V, A)$ if A is a member of $(\Xi(V) \vdash V)$.

If V is a partition such that V is a finite set then a *set of contraction weights for* V is a map ω such that the following three conditions are all satisfied:

(i) if A and B are any members of $\Xi(V)$ such that $B \subseteq A$ holds, then the ordered pair (A, B) is a member of $\mathcal{D}(\omega)$, and ω_{AB} is a real number such that $\omega_{AB} \geq 0$ holds.

(ii) if A is any member of $\Xi(V)$, and F is any partition of A such that $F \subseteq \Xi(V)$ holds, then $\sum_{B\in F} \omega_{AB} = 1$ holds.

(iii) if A, B and C are any members of $\Xi(V)$ such that $C \subseteq B \subseteq A$ holds, then $\omega_{AC} = \omega_{AB}\omega_{BC}$ holds.

We note that these conditions have the immediate consequence that if A and B are any members of $\Xi(V)$ such that $B \subseteq A$ holds, and F is any partition of B such that $F \subseteq \Xi(V)$ holds, then $\omega_{AB} = \sum_{C\in F} \omega_{AC}$ holds. For $\sum_{C\in F} \omega_{AC} = \sum_{C\in F} \omega_{AB}\omega_{BC} = \omega_{AB} \sum_{C\in F} \omega_{BC}$ holds by condition (iii), and $\sum_{C\in F} \omega_{BC} = 1$ holds by condition (ii).

And we note that one class of solutions to these conditions is obtained by making any choice of the real numbers ω_{AC} for $A = \mathcal{U}(V)$ and $C \in V$ such that each of these real numbers is *strictly* greater than 0 and such that their sum is equal to 1, (so that condition (ii) is satisfied for $A = \mathcal{U}(V)$), then using the result of the above paragraph to calculate ω_{AB} when $A = \mathcal{U}(V)$ and B is any member of $\Xi(V)$ as $\omega_{AB} = \sum_{C\in F} \omega_{AC}$, where F is the partition of B whose members are all the members C of V such that $C \subseteq B$ holds, and noting that this ω_{AB} is *strictly* greater than 0, then finally using condition (iii) to calculate ω_{BC}, for any members B and C of $\Xi(V)$ such that $C \subseteq B$ holds, as $\omega_{BC} = \frac{\omega_{AC}}{\omega_{AB}}$. We may verify directly that the map ω constructed in this way satisfies all the conditions (i), (ii), and (iii) above, and we observe that this construction gives the general solution of conditions (i), (ii), and (iii) if ω_{AB} is required to be *strictly* greater than 0 for all members A and B of $\Xi(V)$ such that $B \subseteq A$ holds.

An example of a solution to conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) that does *not* require ω_{AB} to be *strictly* greater than 0 for all members A and B of $\Xi(V)$ such that $B \subseteq A$ holds is obtained by choosing a numbering of a finite number of members of $\mathcal{U}(V)$ such that every member of V has at least one numbered member, and defining $\omega_{AB} \equiv 1$ if B contains the highest-numbered member of A, and $\omega_{AB} \equiv 0$ otherwise.

We observe that it also follows directly from the defining conditions (i), (ii), and (iii) for a set ω of contraction weights for V, that if A is any member of $\Xi(V)$ then $\omega_{AA} = 1$ holds.

For any integer $d \geq 1$ and any ordered pair (V, ω) of a partition V such that V is a finite set, and a set ω of contraction weights for V, we define $\mathbb{U}_d(V, \omega)$ to be the set whose members are all the members x of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\Xi(V)}$ such that for every member A of $(\Xi(V) \vdash V)$, $x_A = \sum\limits_{B\in\mathcal{P}(V,A)} \omega_{AB} x_B$ holds.

Lemma 4. Let V be any partition such that V is a finite set, ω be any set of contraction weights for V, d be any integer ≥ 1, x be any member of $\mathbb{U}_d(V, \omega)$, A be any member of $\Xi(V)$, and F be any partition of A such that every member of F is a member of $\Xi(V)$.

Then $x_A = \sum\limits_{B\in F} \omega_{AB} x_B$ holds.

Proof. We note first that if A is a member of V then the only possible partition F is the partition $F = \{A\}$, hence the stated result follows immediately from the fact that $\omega_{AA} = 1$ holds.

Now suppose A is a member of $(\Xi(V) \vdash V)$. Then we find:

$$\sum_{B\in F} \omega_{AB} x_B = \left(\sum_{B\in(F\cap V)} \omega_{AB} x_B\right) + \left(\sum_{B\in(F\vdash V)} \omega_{AB} x_B\right)$$

$$= \left(\sum_{B \in (F \cap V)} \omega_{AB} x_B \right) + \left(\sum_{B \in (F \vdash V)} \omega_{AB} \left(\sum_{C \in \mathcal{P}(V,B)} \omega_{BC} x_C \right) \right)$$

(by the definition of $\mathbb{U}_d (V, \omega)$)

$$= \left(\sum_{B \in (F \cap V)} \omega_{AB} x_B \right) + \left(\sum_{B \in (F \vdash V)} \left(\sum_{C \in \mathcal{P}(V,B)} \omega_{AC} x_C \right) \right)$$

(by condition (iii) on a set of contraction weights for V.)

But the set whose members are the set $(F \cap V)$, together with the sets $\mathcal{P}(V, B)$ corresponding to the members B of $(F \vdash V)$, is a partition of $\mathcal{P}(V, A)$, hence

$$\left(\sum_{B \in (F \cap V)} \omega_{AB} x_B \right) + \left(\sum_{B \in (F \vdash V)} \left(\sum_{C \in \mathcal{P}(V,B)} \omega_{AC} x_C \right) \right) = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{P}(V,A)} \omega_{AB} x_B = x_A$$

holds.

If d is an integer ≥ 1 and V is a partition such that V is a finite set, then we define $\mathbb{F}_d (V)$ to be the set whose members are all the members x of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\Xi(V)}$ such that if A is any member of $\Xi (V)$ and F is any partition of A such that $F \subseteq \Xi (V)$ holds, then $x_A \in \mathbb{V} (\downarrow (x, F))$ holds, or in other words, x_A is a member of the convex hull of the x_B, $B \in F$.

We observe that if d is any integer ≥ 1, V is any partition such that V is a finite set, and ω is any set of contraction weights for V, then it immediately follows from Lemma 4 together with the defining properties of a set of contraction weights for V, that $\mathbb{U}_d (V, \omega)$ is a subset of $\mathbb{F}_d (V)$.

However $x \in \mathbb{F}_d (V)$ does *not* imply that there exists a set ω of contraction weights for V such that x is a member of $\mathbb{U}_d (V, \omega)$. For example if $d = 1$, V is the partition $\{A, B, C\}$ where A, B, and C are three different, nonintersecting, nonempty sets, and x is the member of $\mathbb{F}_d (V)$ defined by $x_A = -3$, $x_{A \cup C} = -2$, $x_C = -1$, $x_{A \cup B \cup C} = 0$, $x_{B \cup C} = 1$, $x_{A \cup B} = 2$, and $x_B = 3$, then if ω was a set of contraction weights for V such that x was a member of $\mathbb{U}_d (V, \omega)$, then from Lemma 4, condition (ii) on ω, and the partition $\{A, (B \cup C)\}$ we would find $\omega_{(A \cup B \cup C, A)} = \frac{1}{4}$, and from Lemma 4, condition (ii) on ω, and the partition $\{(A \cup B), C\}$ we would find $\omega_{(A \cup B \cup C, A \cup B)} = \frac{1}{3}$, and from the definition of $\mathbb{U}_d (V, \omega)$, condition (ii) on ω, and the partition $\{A, B\}$ we would find $\omega_{(A \cup B, A)} = \frac{1}{6}$, which gives $\omega_{(A \cup B \cup C, A \cup B)} \omega_{(A \cup B, A)} = \frac{1}{18} \neq \frac{1}{4}$ in violation of condition (iii) on ω.

We observe that if V is any partition, F is any partition such that $F \subseteq \Xi(V)$ holds, and A is any member of $\Xi(F)$, then A is a subset of $\mathcal{U}(V)$ such that if B is any member of V, then either $B \subseteq A$ holds or $B \cap A = \emptyset$ holds, hence A is a member of $\Xi(V)$.

Now let d be any integer ≥ 1, V be any partition such that V is a finite set, F be any partition such that $F \subseteq \Xi(V)$ holds, A be any member of $\Xi(F)$, and x be any member of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$. Then $x_A \in \mathbb{V}(\downarrow(x, F))$ holds, or in other words, x_A is a member of the convex hull of the x_B, $B \in F$. For as shown on page 30, if G is the subset of F whose members are all the members B of F such that $B \subseteq A$ holds, then G is a partition of A, hence by the definition of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$, $x_A \in \mathbb{V}(\downarrow(x, G))$ holds. And it follows directly from the fact that G is a subset of F that $\mathbb{V}(\downarrow(x, G)) \subseteq \mathbb{V}(\downarrow(x, F))$ holds, hence $x_A \in \mathbb{V}(\downarrow(x, F))$ holds.

For any ordered triple (F, A, x) of a wood F, a member A of $(\Xi(\mathcal{M}(F)) \vdash \mathcal{M}(F))$, and a member x of $\mathbb{F}_d(\mathcal{M}(F))$, where d is an integer ≥ 1, we define

$$\mathbb{L}(F, A, x) \equiv \max_{\substack{B \in \mathcal{P}(F,A) \\ C \in \mathcal{P}(F,A)}} |x_B - x_C|.$$

We recall from page 25 that for any ordered pair (F, H) of a wood F and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathcal{O}(F, H)$ to be the set whose members are all the members i of $\mathcal{U}(F)$ such that there *exists* a member A of F such that $i \in A$ holds and there is *no* member B of H such that $i \in B$ and $B \subseteq A$ both hold.

And we also recall from page 25 that for any ordered triple (F, H, i) of a wood F, a set H such that every member of H is a set, and a member i of $\mathcal{O}(F, H)$, we define $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ to be the *largest* member A of F such that $i \in A$ holds and there is *no* member B of H such that $i \in B$ and $B \subseteq A$ both hold.

We note that if F is any wood, H is any *partition,* and A is any member of $\Xi(\mathcal{M}(F))$, and i is any member of A and j is any member of $(\mathcal{U}(F) \vdash A)$ such that $\{i, j\}$ is a member of H, then the member $\mathcal{C}(F, i)$ of $\mathcal{M}(F)$ intersects A hence is a subset of A, hence j is *not* a member of $\mathcal{C}(F, i)$, hence the *unique* member $\{i, j\}$ of H that has i as a member, is *not* a subset of $\mathcal{C}(F, i)$, hence i is a member of $\mathcal{O}(F, H)$, hence $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ is defined, and moreover $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ is the largest member of F that has i as a member but does *not* have j as a member, and furthermore since j is *not* a member of A, the member $\mathcal{C}(F, j)$ of $\mathcal{M}(F)$ is *not* a subset of A, hence $\mathcal{C}(F, j)$ does *not* intersect A, hence i is *not* a member of $\mathcal{C}(F, j)$, hence the *unique* member $\{i, j\}$ of H that has j as a member, is *not* a subset of $\mathcal{C}(F, j)$, hence j is a member of $\mathcal{O}(F, H)$, hence $\mathcal{Z}\left(F, H, j\right)$ is defined, and moreover $\mathcal{Z}\left(F, H, j\right)$ is the largest member of F that has j as a member but does *not* have i as a member.

Lemma 5. Let V be any partition such that $\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)$ is finite and $\#\left(V\right) \geq 2$ holds, let P be any wood of V, let H be any partition such that if E is any member of H such that E intersects *more* than one member of V, then E has *exactly* two members, let A be any member of $\left(\Xi\left(V\right) \vdash V\right)$ such that A is $\left(V \cup H\right)$-connected, let λ be any real number such that $0 < \lambda < \frac{1}{2}$ holds, let d be any integer ≥ 1, and let x be any member of $\mathbb{F}_d\left(V\right)$. Let F be any wood of V such that $P \subseteq F$ holds, and such that for every ordered triple $\left(B, i, j\right)$ of a member B of $\left(F \vdash P\right)$ such that $B \subset A$ holds and B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$, and a member i of B and a member j of $\left(A \vdash B\right)$ such that $\{i, j\} \in H$ holds, there exists a wood G of V such that $P \subseteq G$ holds, A overlaps no member of G, and $\mathbb{L}\left(P, B, x\right) \leq \lambda \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,j)}\right|$ holds.

Then $\mathbb{L}\left(P, A, x\right) \leq \left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right) \mathbb{L}\left(F, A, x\right)$ holds.

Proof. We first note that, as shown on page 23, if B is any member of F such that $B \subset A$ holds, then there is a unique member D of $\mathcal{P}\left(F, A\right)$ such that $B \subseteq D$ holds.

Let B and C be any members of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$, and let D and E be the members of $\mathcal{P}\left(F, A\right)$ such that $B \subseteq D$ and $C \subseteq E$ hold. Then $\left|x_B - x_C\right| \leq \left|x_B - x_D\right| + \left|x_D - x_E\right| + \left|x_E - x_C\right|$ holds by the triangle inequality.

We next note that if $D = B$ holds, then $\left|x_B - x_D\right| = 0$ holds.

Suppose now that $B \subset D$ holds. Then D cannot be a member of P, for $B \in \mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$ holds, $D \subset A$ holds, and by the definition of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$, there is no member D of P such that $B \subset D$ and $D \subset A$ both hold. Hence $D \in \left(F \vdash P\right)$ holds.

Now $\mathcal{P}\left(P, D\right)$ is a partition of D, hence by the definition of $\mathbb{F}_d\left(V\right)$, $x_D \in \mathbb{V}\left(\downarrow\left(x, \mathcal{P}\left(P, D\right)\right)\right)$ holds, or in other words, x_D is a member of the convex hull of the x_M, $M \in \mathcal{P}\left(P, D\right)$. And B is a member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, D\right)$, (for $B \subset D$ holds, and there can be no member N of P such that $B \subset N$ and $N \subset D$ both hold, for such an N would satisfy both $B \subset N$ and $N \subset A$, contradicting $B \in \mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$). Hence x_B is certainly a member of the convex hull of the x_M, $M \in \mathcal{P}\left(P, D\right)$. Hence by Lemma 3, $\left|x_B - x_D\right| \leq \mathbb{L}\left(P, D, x\right)$ holds.

Now $D \subset A$ holds, and A is $\left(V \cup H\right)$-connected by assumption, hence there exists a member S of $\left(V \cup H\right)$ such that S intersects both D and $\left(A \vdash D\right)$. And both D and $\left(A \vdash D\right)$ are members of $\Xi\left(V\right)$, hence no member of V intersects both D and $\left(A \vdash D\right)$, hence there exists a member S of H such that S intersects both D and

$(A \vdash D)$. Let S be a member of H such that S intersects both D and $(A \vdash D)$. Then S intersects more than one member of V, hence by assumption S has exactly two members. Let i be the member of S that is a member of D, and let j be the member of S that is a member of $(A \vdash D)$. Now D is a member of $(F \vdash P)$ such that $D \subset A$ holds. And D is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, for $B \subset D$ holds and $B \in \mathcal{P}(P, A)$ holds. Hence by assumption there exists a wood G of V such that $P \subseteq G$ holds, A overlaps no member of G, and $\mathbb{L}(P, D, x) \leq \lambda \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,j)}\right|$ holds. Let G be such a wood of V. Then $\mathcal{Z}(G, H, i) \cap A$ has the member i hence is nonempty, $A \vdash \mathcal{Z}(G, H, i)$ has the member j hence is nonempty, and A does not overlap $\mathcal{Z}(G, H, i)$, hence $\mathcal{Z}(G, H, i) \subset A$ holds, and $\mathcal{Z}(G, H, j) \cap A$ has the member j hence is nonempty, $A \vdash \mathcal{Z}(G, H, j)$ has the member i hence is nonempty, and A does not overlap $\mathcal{Z}(G, H, j)$, hence $\mathcal{Z}(G, H, j) \subset A$ holds. Furthermore H is a partition by assumption, hence $S = \{i, j\}$ is the *only* member of H that has i as a member, hence $\mathcal{Z}(G, H, i)$ is the largest member of G that has i as a member but does not have j as a member, hence since $P \subseteq G$ holds and i and j are members of *distinct* members of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, (for $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$ is a subset of D, while $\mathcal{K}(P, A, j)$ does not intersect D), $\mathcal{Z}(G, H, i)$ is *not* a strict subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, hence $\mathcal{Z}(G, H, i)$ is a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$, hence, as shown on page 33, the fact that x is a member of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$ implies that $x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)}$ is a member of the convex hull of the x_M, $M \in \mathcal{P}(P, A)$. And similarly, $x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,j)}$ is a member of the convex hull of the x_M, $M \in \mathcal{P}(P, A)$. Hence by Lemma 3, $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,j)}\right| \leq \mathbb{L}(P, A, x)$ holds. Hence $\mathbb{L}(P, D, x) \leq \lambda \mathbb{L}(P, A, x)$ holds, hence $|x_B - x_D| \leq \lambda \mathbb{L}(P, A, x)$ holds.

And similarly, $|x_E - x_C| \leq \lambda \mathbb{L}(P, A, x)$ holds.

Hence $|x_B - x_C| \leq 2\lambda \mathbb{L}(P, A, x) + |x_D - x_E|$ holds. But $|x_D - x_E| \leq \mathbb{L}(F, A, x)$ holds by the definition of $\mathbb{L}(F, A, x)$, hence $|x_B - x_C| \leq 2\lambda \mathbb{L}(P, A, x) + \mathbb{L}(F, A, x)$ holds.

And *this* is true for all members B and C of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, hence $\mathbb{L}(P, A, x) \leq 2\lambda \mathbb{L}(P, A, x) + \mathbb{L}(F, A, x)$ holds, hence $\mathbb{L}(P, A, x) \leq \left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right) \mathbb{L}(F, A, x)$ holds, since by assumption $0 < \lambda < \frac{1}{2}$ holds.

We recall from page 24 that if P is a wood, then we define the wood $\bar{P}$ by $\bar{P} \equiv P \cup \{\mathcal{U}(P)\}$, and we note that if A is any member of $\Xi(\mathcal{M}(P))$, then $\bar{P}$ has at least one member, namely $\mathcal{U}(P)$, that contains A as a subset, hence it follows directly from the definition on page 24 of the function $\mathcal{Y}$, that $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, A\right)$ is the *smallest* member B

of $\bar{P}$ such that $A \subseteq B$ holds.

For any ordered septuple $(P, F, H, A, \sigma, R, x)$ of a wood P, a wood F such that $\mathcal{M}(F) = \mathcal{M}(P)$ holds and $P \subseteq F$ holds, a partition H, a member A of $(\Xi(\mathcal{M}(P)) \vdash \mathcal{M}(P))$, a real number σ such that $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{1}{8}$ holds, a finite real number $R > 0$, and a member x of $\mathbb{F}_d(\mathcal{M}(P))$, where d is an integer ≥ 1, we define the proposition $\mathbb{M}(P, F, H, A, \sigma, R, x)$ as follows:

$\mathbb{M}(P, F, H, A, \sigma, R, x)$: $\mathbb{L}(F, A, x) < R$ holds, and for every member i of A and every member j of $\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, A\right) \vdash A\right)$ such that $\{i, j\}$ is a member of H, $\mathbb{L}(F, A, x) < \sigma \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|$ holds.

For every ordered pair (V, H) of a partition V such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$ to be the set whose members are all the woods F of V such that every member A of F is $(V \cup H)$-connected.

We recall from page 25 that for any sets A and B we define $\mathbb{K}(A, B)$ to be the set whose members are all the sets C such that $A \subseteq C$ and $C \subseteq B$ both hold, and we note that if V is any partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, and P and Q are any woods of V such that $P \subseteq Q$ holds, then it follows directly from the definition of a wood of V that every member of $\mathbb{K}(P, Q)$ is also a wood of V.

We note that if V is any partition, then V may be calculated from $\Xi(V)$ by $V = \mathcal{M}(\Xi(V))$, and we also note that if d is any integer ≥ 1, V is any partition such that V is a finite set, and x is any member of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$, then $\Xi(V)$ may be calculated from x by $\Xi(V) = \mathcal{D}(x)$, hence V may be calculated from x by $V = \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}(x))$.

If d is any integer ≥ 1 and V is any partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, then for every ordered quadruple (H, σ, R, x) of a partition H, a real number σ such that $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{1}{8}$ holds, a finite real number $R > 0$, and a member x of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$, we define $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ to be the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (P, Q) of members P and Q of $\mathcal{G}(V, H) = \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}(x)), H)$ such that $P \subseteq Q$ holds, and for every member A of $(Q \vdash P)$, there *exists* a member F of $\mathbb{K}(P, Q)$ such that $\mathbb{M}(P, F, H, A, \sigma, R, x)$ holds. (Note that F does *not* have to be the same for every member A of $(Q \vdash P)$.)

We note that it immediately follows from this definition that for every member F of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$, the ordered pair (F, F) is a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$.

Lemma 6. Let V be any partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, and let H be any partition such that if E is any member of H such that E intersects *more* than one member of V, then E has *exactly* two members.

Let σ be any real number such that $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{1}{8}$ holds, and let λ be the real number defined by $\lambda \equiv \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - 8\sigma}\right)$, so that $0 < \lambda \leq \frac{1}{4}$ holds.

We note that λ and σ satisfy the equation $\lambda = \frac{\sigma}{1-2\lambda}$, and that $0 < \sigma < \lambda$ holds.

Let R be any finite real number > 0, let d be any integer ≥ 1, let x be any member of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$, and let (P, Q) be any member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$.

Then the following results hold:

(a) Let A be any member of $(Q \vdash P)$, let i be any member of A and j be any member of $\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, A\right) \vdash A\right)$ such that $\{i, j\}$ is a member of H, and let F be any member of $\mathbb{K}(P, Q)$ such that $\mathbb{M}(P, F, H, A, \sigma, R, x)$ holds.

Then $\mathbb{L}(P, A, x) < \lambda \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|$ holds.

Proof. The proof is by induction on the number of members B of $(Q \vdash P)$ such that $B \subset A$ holds and B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$.

Suppose first there are *no* members B of $(Q \vdash P)$ such that $B \subset A$ holds and B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$. Then $\mathcal{P}(P, A) = \mathcal{P}(F, A)$ holds, hence $\mathbb{L}(P, A, x) = \mathbb{L}(F, A, x)$ holds, hence $\mathbb{L}(P, A, x) < \sigma \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|$ holds by $\mathbb{M}(P, F, H, A, \sigma, R, x)$. But $0 < \sigma < \lambda$ holds, hence $\mathbb{L}(P, A, x) < \lambda \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|$ holds.

Now, as the induction assumption, assume that for every member B of $(Q \vdash P)$ such that $B \subset A$ holds and B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, that if k is any member of B and m is any member of $\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right) \vdash B\right)$ such that $\{k, m\}$ is a member of H, and G is any member of $\mathbb{K}(P, Q)$ such that $\mathbb{M}(P, G, H, B, \sigma, R, x)$ holds, then $\mathbb{L}(P, B, x) < \lambda \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,k)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,m)}\right|$ holds.

Now $(P, Q) \in \Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ implies that for any member B of $(Q \vdash P)$, there exists a member G of $\mathbb{K}(P, Q)$ such that $\mathbb{M}(P, G, H, B, \sigma, R, x)$ holds. And $F \subseteq Q$ implies that every member of $(F \vdash P)$ is a member of $(Q \vdash P)$. Hence the induction assumption implies that for every ordered triple (B, k, m) of a member B of $(F \vdash P)$ such that $B \subset A$ holds and B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, and a member k of B and a member m of $\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right) \vdash B\right)$ such that $\{k, m\}$ is a member of H, there exists a wood G of V such that $G \in \mathbb{K}(P, Q)$ holds, (hence $P \subseteq G$ holds, and A overlaps no member of G, since A is a member of Q), and $\mathbb{L}(P, B, x) \leq \lambda \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,k)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,m)}\right|$

holds. Now if B is any member of $(F \vdash P)$ such that $B \subset A$ holds and B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, then $A \subseteq \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$ holds, for both A and $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$ are members of the wood $\bar{Q}$, hence A does not overlap $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$, and $A \cap \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$ has the nonempty subset B hence is nonempty, and $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right) \subset A$ cannot hold, for if $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right) \subset A$ held then since $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$ is a member of $\bar{P}$, $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$ would be a subset of some member of $\mathcal{P}\left(\bar{P}, A\right) = \mathcal{P}(P, A)$, as shown on page 23, which contradicts the assumption that B is not a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$. Hence the induction assumption implies that for every ordered triple (B, k, m) of a member B of $(F \vdash P)$ such that $B \subset A$ holds and B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, and a member k of B and a member m of $(A \vdash B)$ such that $\{k, m\} \in H$ holds, there exists a wood G of V such that $P \subseteq G$ holds, A overlaps no member of G, and $\mathbb{L}(P, B, x) \leq \lambda \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,k)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,m)}\right|$ holds.

Furthermore, it follows directly from $A \in (Q \vdash P)$ and the definition of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ that A is a member of $(\Xi(V) \vdash V)$ such that A is $(V \cup H)$-connected, and it follows directly from the definitions of σ and λ that $0 < \lambda < \frac{1}{2}$ holds.

Hence by Lemma 5, the induction assumption implies that $\mathbb{L}(P, A, x) \leq \left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right) \mathbb{L}(F, A, x)$ holds.

Now $\mathbb{M}(P, F, H, A, \sigma, R, x)$ implies that $\mathbb{L}(F, A, x) < \sigma \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|$ holds, hence $\mathbb{L}(P, A, x) < \left(\frac{\sigma}{1-2\lambda}\right) \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|$ holds.

But $\left(\frac{\sigma}{1-2\lambda}\right) = \lambda$ holds, hence $\mathbb{L}(P, A, x) < \lambda \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|$ holds, which completes the proof of the induction step.

(b) Let A be any member of $(\Xi(V) \vdash V)$ such that A is $(V \cup H)$-connected and A overlaps no member of Q, and let F be *any* member of $\mathbb{K}(P, Q)$. Then $\mathbb{L}(P, A, x) \leq \left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right) \mathbb{L}(F, A, x)$ holds.

Proof. From $(P, Q) \in \Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ it follows that for every member B of $(Q \vdash P)$, hence for every member B of $(F \vdash P)$, there exists a wood G of V such that $G \in \mathbb{K}(P, Q)$ holds, (hence $P \subseteq G$ holds, and $G \subseteq Q$ holds, hence A overlaps no member of G), and $\mathbb{M}(P, G, H, B, \sigma, R, x)$ holds. Hence by Lemma 6 (a) above it follows that for every ordered triple (B, i, j) of a member B of $(Q \vdash P)$, and a member i of B and a member j of $\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right) \vdash B\right)$ such that $\{i, j\}$ is a member of H, there exists a wood G of V such that $P \subseteq G$ holds, A overlaps no member of G, and $\mathbb{L}(P, B, x) < \lambda \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,j)}\right|$ holds, and this is true in particular when B is a member of

$(F \vdash P)$ such that $B \subset A$ holds and B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$. And if B is a member of $(F \vdash P)$ such that $B \subset A$ holds and B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, then it follows directly from the fact that A overlaps no member of Q, (hence that A does not overlap $\mathcal{Y}(\bar{P}, B)$), that $A \subseteq \mathcal{Y}(\bar{P}, B)$ holds. And furthermore, $0 < \lambda < \frac{1}{2}$ holds in consequence of the definitions of σ and λ. Hence by Lemma 5, $\mathbb{L}(P, A, x) \leq \left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right) \mathbb{L}(F, A, x)$ holds.

(c) Let A be any member of $(\Xi(V) \vdash V)$ such that A is $(V \cup H)$-connected and A overlaps no member of Q, and let F and G be any members of $\mathbb{K}(P, Q)$. Then $\mathbb{L}(G, A, x) \leq \left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right) \mathbb{L}(F, A, x)$ holds.

Proof. We first note that if B is any member of $\mathcal{P}(G, A)$, then B is a subset of A such that B overlaps no member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, and furthermore B cannot be a strict subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, for if D was a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ such that $B \subset D$ held, then D would be a member of G such that $B \subset D$ and $D \subset A$ both held, contradicting $B \in \mathcal{P}(G, A)$. Hence B is a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$, hence, as shown on page 33, it follows directly from the fact that x is a member of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$, that x_B is a member of the convex hull of the $x_E, E \in \mathcal{P}(P, A)$.

Now let B and C be any members of $\mathcal{P}(G, A)$. Then as just shown, x_B and x_C are members of the convex hull of the $x_E, E \in \mathcal{P}(P, A)$. Hence $\mathbb{L}(G, A, x) \leq \mathbb{L}(P, A, x)$ holds by Lemma 3, hence $\mathbb{L}(G, A, x) \leq \left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right) \mathbb{L}(F, A, x)$ holds by Lemma 6 (b) above.

(d) Let i and j be any two members of $\mathcal{U}(V)$ such that i and j are members of *distinct* members of V, (or in other words, such that $\mathcal{C}(V, i) \neq \mathcal{C}(V, j)$ holds), and such that $\{i, j\}$ is a member of H, let F and G be any members of $\mathbb{K}(P, Q)$, and let $T \equiv \max\limits_{M \in \mathbb{K}(P,Q)} \left| x_{\mathcal{Z}(M,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(M,H,j)} \right|$.

Then $\left| x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)} \right| \leq \lambda T$ holds.

Proof. We note that $F \subseteq Q$ and $G \subseteq Q$ both hold, hence $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i) \in Q$ and $\mathcal{Z}(G, H, i) \in Q$ both hold, hence $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(G, H, i)$ do not overlap. Furthermore $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i) \cap \mathcal{Z}(G, H, i)$ has the member i hence is nonempty, hence exactly one of the three possibilities $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i) = \mathcal{Z}(G, H, i)$, $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i) \subset \mathcal{Z}(G, H, i)$, and $\mathcal{Z}(G, H, i) \subset \mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ holds.

Suppose first that $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i) = \mathcal{Z}(G, H, i)$ holds. Then $\left| x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)} \right| = 0$ holds.

Now suppose that $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i) \subset \mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)$ holds. Then $\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i) \in P$ cannot hold. For if $\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i) \in P$ holds, then $\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i) \in F$ holds since $P \subseteq F$ holds. But $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$ is by definition the *largest* member of F that has i as a member but does not contain as a subset any member of H that has i as a member, hence $\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i) \in P$ implies that $\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$ holds, which contradicts the assumption that $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i) \subset \mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)$ holds. Hence the assumption that $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i) \subset \mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)$ holds, implies that $\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i) \in (Q \vdash P)$ holds.

Now that $\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i) \in (Q \vdash P)$ holds implies that there exists a member M of $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$ such that $\mathbb{M}(P,M,H,\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i),\sigma,R,x)$ holds. Let M be a member of $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$ such that $\mathbb{M}(P,M,H,\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i),\sigma,R,x)$ holds. Now *suppose* there exists a member A of P such that $\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i) \subset A$ holds and j is *not* a member of A. Then since H is a *partition,* hence $\{i,j\}$ is the *only* member of H that has i as a member, A is a member of P, hence a member of G, such that $i \in A$ holds and there is *no* member E of H such that $i \in E$ and $E \subseteq A$ both hold, hence $A \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)$ holds, which contradicts the assumption that $\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i) \subset A$ holds. Hence there is *no* member A of P such that $\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i) \subset A$ holds and j is *not* a member of A hence, since $\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)$ is not a member of P, $j \in \left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P},\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)\right) \vdash \mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)\right)$ holds hence, by Lemma 6 (a) above, $\mathbb{L}(P,\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i),x) < \lambda\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(M,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(M,H,j)}\right| \leq \lambda T$ holds.

Now $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i) \subset \mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)$ holds by assumption, and $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$ overlaps no member of $\mathcal{P}(P,\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i))$, and furthermore, $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$ cannot be a strict subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P,\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i))$. For *suppose* $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$ is a strict subset of a member B of $\mathcal{P}(P,\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i))$. Then B would be a member of P, hence a member of F, such that $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i) \subset B \subset \mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)$ holds, hence B would be a member of F such that $i \in B$ holds and there is *no* member E of H such that $i \in E$ and $E \subseteq B$ both hold, (for there is certainly no member E of H such that $i \in E$ and $E \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)$ both hold), hence $B \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$ would hold, in contradiction with the assumption that $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i) \subset B$ holds. Hence $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$ is a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P,\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)))$ hence, as shown on page 33, it follows directly from the fact that x is a member of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$, that $x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)}$ is a member of the convex hull of the x_B, $B \in \mathcal{P}(P,\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i))$. And $\mathcal{P}(P,\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i))$ is a partition of $\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)$, hence by the definition of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$, $x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)}$ is also a member of the convex hull of the x_B, $B \in \mathcal{P}(P,\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i))$. Hence by Lemma 3, $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)}\right| \leq \mathbb{L}(P,\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i),x)$ holds, hence by the paragraph above, $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)}\right| < \lambda T$ holds.

And if $\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i) \subset \mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$ holds, then by an analogous argument, $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)}\right| < \lambda T$ holds.

Hence, in every case, $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)}\right| < \lambda T$ holds.

(e) Let i and j be any two members of $\mathcal{U}(V)$ such that i and j are members of *distinct* members of V, (or in other words, such that $\mathcal{C}(V,i) \neq \mathcal{C}(V,j)$ holds), and such that $\{i,j\}$ is a member of H, let F be any member of $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$, and let $T \equiv \max\limits_{M \in \mathbb{K}(P,Q)} \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(M,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(M,H,j)}\right|$.

Then $T \leq \left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right) \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|$ holds.

Proof. Let G be any member of $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$. Then by the triangle inequality,

$$\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,j)}\right| \leq \left\{\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)}\right| + \right.$$
$$\left. + \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right| + \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,j)}\right|\right\}$$

holds.

And by Lemma 6 (d) above, $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)}\right| \leq \lambda T$ holds and $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,j)}\right| \leq \lambda T$ holds.

Hence $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,j)}\right| \leq 2\lambda T + \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|$ holds.

And, since G is an arbitrary member of $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$, this inequality holds for *every* member G of $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$. Hence $T \leq 2\lambda T + \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|$ holds, hence $T \leq \left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right) \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|$ holds.

(f) Let A be any member of $(Q \vdash P)$, let i and j be any two members of A such that i and j are members of *distinct* members of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$, (or in other words, such that $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i) \neq \mathcal{K}(P,A,j)$ holds), and such that $\{i,j\}$ is a member of H, let k be any member of A and m be any member of $\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P},A\right) \vdash A\right)$ such that $\{k,m\}$ is a member of H, and let F be any member of $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$.

Then $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right| < \left(\frac{\lambda}{1-2\lambda}\right) \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,k)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,m)}\right|$ holds and $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right| < \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,k)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,m)}\right|$ holds.

Proof. We first note that A is a member of $(Q \vdash P)$ by assumption, hence the fact that (P,Q) is a member of $\Omega(H,\sigma,R,x)$ implies that there exists a member G of $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$ such that $\mathbb{M}(P,G,H,A,\sigma,R,x)$ holds. Let G be a member of $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$ such that $\mathbb{M}(P,G,H,A,\sigma,R,x)$ holds. Then by Lemma 6 (a) above, $\mathbb{L}(P,A,x) < \lambda \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,k)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,m)}\right|$ holds.

Now by assumption, i and j are members of *distinct* members of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, hence since $\{i, j\}$ is a member of H and H is a partition, $\{i, j\}$ is the *only* member of H to have i as a member, hence $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ is *not* a strict subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, and similarly $\{i, j\}$ is the *only* member of H to have j as a member, hence $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, j)$ is *not* a strict subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$. Furthermore, A is a member of Q, hence A does not overlap $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$, hence since $A \cap \mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ has the member i hence is nonempty, and $A \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ cannot hold since the member $\{i, j\}$ of H is a subset of A, $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i) \subset A$ holds. And similarly, $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, j) \subset A$ holds. And furthermore neither $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ nor $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, j)$ overlaps any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, hence $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i) \in \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$ holds and $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, j) \in \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$ holds hence, as shown on page 33, it follows directly from the fact that x is a member of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$, that both $x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)}$ and $x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}$ are members of the convex hull of the x_B, $B \in \mathcal{P}(P, A)$, hence by Lemma 3, $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right| \leq \mathbb{L}(P, A, x)$ holds.

Hence $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right| < \lambda \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,k)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,m)}\right|$ holds.

And by Lemma 6 (e) above, $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,k)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,m)}\right| \leq \left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right) \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,k)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,m)}\right|$ holds, hence
$\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right| < \left(\frac{\lambda}{1-2\lambda}\right) \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,k)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,m)}\right|$ holds.

And finally, $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{1}{8}$ holds by assumption, hence $0 < \lambda \leq \frac{1}{4}$ holds, hence $(1 - 2\lambda) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ holds, hence $\left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right) \leq 2$ holds, hence $\left(\frac{\lambda}{1-2\lambda}\right) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ holds, hence
$\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right| < \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,k)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,m)}\right|$ holds.

Lemma 7. Let V be any partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, let H be any partition such that if E is any member of H such that E intersects *more* than one member of V, then E has *exactly* two members, let σ be any real number such that $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{3}{25}$ holds, let R be any finite real number > 0, let d be any integer ≥ 1, and let x be any member of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$.

Let (P_1, Q_1) and (P_2, Q_2) be any members of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ such that $(P_1 \cup P_2) \subseteq (Q_1 \cap Q_2)$ holds. Then $(Q_1 \cup Q_2)$ is a wood, and $((P_1 \cap P_2), (Q_1 \cup Q_2))$ is a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$.

Proof. We note first that, as observed on page 22, it follows directly from the definition of a wood of V, that $(P_1 \cap P_2)$ is a wood of V.

And we also note that, as observed on page 22, it follows directly from the definition of a wood of V, that $(Q_1 \cup Q_2)$ is a wood of V, *unless* there is a member of Q_1 which overlaps a member of Q_2.

Suppose now that a member A of Q_1 overlaps a member B of Q_2. Then $(A \vdash B)$, $(A \cap B)$, and $(B \vdash A)$ are all nonempty, hence, since both A and B are H-connected (by the definition of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$), there exists a member i of $(A \vdash B)$ and a member j of $(A \cap B)$ such that $\{i, j\} \in H$ holds, and there exists a member k of $(A \cap B)$ and a member m of $(B \vdash A)$ such that $\{k, m\} \in H$ holds.

Now the assumption that A overlaps B implies that $A \notin Q_2$ and that $B \notin Q_1$, since Q_1 and Q_2 are woods. And the assumption that $(P_1 \cup P_2) \subseteq (Q_1 \cap Q_2)$ holds, implies that every member of P_1 is a member of Q_2, and every member of P_2 is a member of Q_1. Hence $A \notin Q_2$ implies that $A \notin P_1$, hence that $A \in (Q_1 \vdash P_1)$ holds, and $B \notin Q_1$ implies that $B \notin P_2$, hence that $B \in (Q_2 \vdash P_2)$ holds.

Furthermore $\{i, j\}$ cannot be a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P_1, A)$. For $P_1 \subseteq Q_2$ holds and $B \in Q_2$ holds, hence B overlaps no member of P_1. Suppose there exists a member E of $\mathcal{P}(P_1, A)$, hence of P_1, such that $\{i, j\} \subseteq E$ holds. Then $\{i, j\} \subseteq E \subset A$ holds, hence $i \in (E \vdash B)$ holds, $j \in (E \cap B)$ holds, and $m \in (B \vdash E)$ holds, hence E overlaps B, which is impossible. Hence i and j are members of *distinct* members of $\mathcal{P}(P_1, A)$.

And by an exactly analogous argument, $\{k, m\}$ cannot be a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P_2, B)$, hence k and m are members of *distinct* members of $\mathcal{P}(P_2, B)$.

Furthermore, $m \in \mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_1}, A\right)$ holds, hence $m \in \left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_1}, A\right) \vdash A\right)$ holds. For $i \in (A \vdash B)$ holds, hence $i \in \left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_1}, A\right) \vdash B\right)$ holds, hence $\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_1}, A\right) \vdash B\right)$ is nonempty, and $j \in (A \cap B)$ holds, hence $j \in \left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_1}, A\right) \cap B\right)$ holds, hence $\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_1}, A\right) \cap B\right)$ is nonempty. But if m was not a member of $\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_1}, A\right)$, then m would be a member of $\left(B \vdash \mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_1}, A\right)\right)$, hence $\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_1}, A\right) \vdash B\right)$, $\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_1}, A\right) \cap B\right)$, and $\left(B \vdash \mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_1}, A\right)\right)$ would all be nonempty, hence $\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_1}, A\right)$ would overlap B, contradicting the fact, shown above, that B overlaps no member of P_1.

And by an exactly analogous argument, $i \in \mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_2}, B\right)$ holds, hence $i \in \left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_2}, B\right) \vdash B\right)$ holds.

Furthermore the assumption that $(P_1 \cup P_2) \subseteq (Q_1 \cap Q_2)$ holds, implies that there exists a wood F such that both $P_1 \subseteq F \subseteq Q_1$ holds and $P_2 \subseteq F \subseteq Q_2$ holds, (hence that $\mathbb{K}(P_1, Q_1) \cap \mathbb{K}(P_2, Q_2)$ is nonempty). For example, F could be $P_1 \cup P_2$ or $Q_1 \cap Q_2$. Let F be a wood such that both $P_1 \subseteq F \subseteq Q_1$ and $P_2 \subseteq F \subseteq Q_2$ hold. Then by Lemma 6 (f) for (P_1, Q_1) and A, $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right| < \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,k)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,m)}\right|$ holds, whereas by Lemma 6 (f) for (P_2, Q_2) and B, $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,k)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,m)}\right| < \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|$ holds, which is impossible. Hence no member of Q_1 can overlap any member of Q_2, hence $(Q_1 \cup Q_2)$ is a wood of V.

Now $(P_1 \cap P_2) \subseteq (Q_1 \cup Q_2)$ certainly holds.

Furthermore, the assumption that $(P_1 \cup P_2) \subseteq (Q_1 \cap Q_2)$ holds, implies that $((Q_1 \cup Q_2) \vdash (P_1 \cap P_2)) \subseteq ((Q_1 \vdash P_1) \cup (Q_2 \vdash P_2))$ holds. For let A be any member of $((Q_1 \cup Q_2) \vdash (P_1 \cap P_2))$. Suppose first that $A \notin (Q_1 \cap Q_2)$. Then $(P_1 \cup P_2) \subseteq (Q_1 \cap Q_2)$ implies A is *not* a member of $(P_1 \cup P_2)$, hence A is a member of at least one of Q_1 and Q_2, and is a member of neither P_1 nor P_2, hence at least one of $A \in (Q_1 \vdash P_1)$ and $A \in (Q_2 \vdash P_2)$ holds. Now suppose that $A \in (Q_1 \cap Q_2)$. Then A is a member of both Q_1 and Q_2, but is *not* a member of *both* P_1 and P_2, hence again at least one of $A \in (Q_1 \vdash P_1)$ and $A \in (Q_2 \vdash P_2)$ holds.

We shall now show that if A is any member of $((Q_1 \cup Q_2) \vdash (P_1 \cap P_2))$, then there exists a member F of $\mathbb{K}((P_1 \cap P_2), (Q_1 \cup Q_2))$ such that $\mathbb{M}((P_1 \cap P_2), F, H, A, \sigma, R, x)$ holds.

Let A be any member of $((Q_1 \cup Q_2) \vdash (P_1 \cap P_2))$. Then, as just shown, A is a member of at least one of $(Q_1 \vdash P_1)$ and $(Q_2 \vdash P_2)$.

Suppose first that A is equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$. Then $\mathbb{M}((P_1 \cap P_2), F, H, A, \sigma, R, x)$ reduces to the requirement that $\mathbb{L}(F, A, x) < R$ holds. Suppose first that A is a member of $(Q_1 \vdash P_1)$. Then there exists a member F of $\mathbb{K}(P_1, Q_1)$ such that $\mathbb{M}(P_1, F, H, A, \sigma, R, x)$ holds, hence such that $\mathbb{L}(F, A, x) < R$ holds, hence such that $\mathbb{M}((P_1 \cap P_2), F, H, A, \sigma, R, x)$ holds, and furthermore F is a member of $\mathbb{K}((P_1 \cap P_2), (Q_1 \cup Q_2))$, since $(P_1 \cap P_2) \subseteq P_1 \subseteq F \subseteq Q_1 \subseteq (Q_1 \cup Q_2)$ holds. Now suppose that A is not a member of $(Q_1 \vdash P_1)$. Then A *is* a member of $(Q_2 \vdash P_2)$, and by an exactly analogous argument there exists a member F of $\mathbb{K}(P_2, Q_2)$ with the required properties.

We now assume that A is *not* equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$.

We suppose first that $A \in (Q_1 \vdash P_1)$ holds, and define S to be the unique map which satisfies the following three requirements.

(i) $\mathcal{D}(S) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$

(ii) 0 is a member of $\mathcal{D}(S)$, and $S_0 \equiv A$

(iii) If r is a member of $\mathcal{D}(S)$ and S_r is a member of $\overline{(P_1 \cap P_2)}$, then r is the largest member of $\mathcal{D}(s)$, while otherwise $(r+1)$ is a member of $\mathcal{D}(S)$ and

$$S_{r+1} \equiv \begin{cases} \mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_1}, S_r\right) & (r \text{ even}) \\ \mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_2}, S_r\right) & (r \text{ odd}) \end{cases}$$

Thus $S_1 = \mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_1}, A\right)$, and if $\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_1}, A\right)$ is not a member of $\overline{P_2}$, then $S_2 = \mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_2}, \mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_1}, A\right)\right)$, and so on.

Let n be the largest member of $\mathcal{D}(S)$, so $n \geq 1$ holds.

Then if $r \geq 1$ and $r \leq (n-1)$ both hold, we have that for r odd, $S_r \in (P_1 \vdash P_2)$ holds hence $S_r \in (Q_2 \vdash P_2)$ holds, (since $P_1 \subseteq Q_2$ holds, while for r even, $S_r \in (P_2 \vdash P_1)$ holds hence $S_r \in (Q_1 \vdash P_1)$ holds (since $P_2 \subseteq Q_1$ holds). (Hence $S_r \in (Q_1 \vdash P_1)$ holds for *all* even r, $0 \leq r \leq (n-1)$.)

Hence the fact that (P_1, Q_1) is a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ implies that for all even r, $0 \leq r \leq (n-1)$, there exists a member F_r of $\mathbb{K}(P_1, Q_1)$ such that $\mathbb{M}(P_1, F_r, H, S_r, \sigma, R, x)$ holds, and the fact that (P_2, Q_2) is a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ implies that for all odd r, $0 \leq r \leq (n-1)$, there exists a member F_r of $\mathbb{K}(P_2, Q_2)$ such that $\mathbb{M}(P_2, F_r, H, S_r, \sigma, R, x)$ holds.

We now make a fixed choice of an F_r for each $0 \leq r \leq (n-1)$ such that for r even, $F_r \in \mathbb{K}(P_1, Q_1)$ holds and $\mathbb{M}(P_1, F_r, H, S_r, \sigma, R, x)$ holds, while for r odd, $F_r \in \mathbb{K}(P_2, Q_2)$ holds and $\mathbb{M}(P_2, F_r, H, S_r, \sigma, R, x)$ holds.

We note in particular that from $\mathbb{M}(P_1, F_0, H, A, \sigma, R, x)$, that $\mathbb{L}(F_0, A, x) \leq R$ holds.

Then for all $0 \leq r \leq (n-1)$ we choose a member k_r of S_r and a member m_r of $(S_{r+1} \vdash S_r)$ such that $\{k_r, m_r\} \in H$ holds. Such a $\{k_r, m_r\}$ exists since S_r and $(S_{r+1} \vdash S_r)$ are nonempty and S_{r+1} is $(V \cup H)$-connected, and each member of V is either a subset of S_r or else does not intersect S_r.

Then for all even r, $0 \leq r \leq (n-1)$, we have from $\mathbb{M}(P_1, F_r, H, S_r, \sigma, R, x)$ that

$$\mathbb{L}(F_r, S_r, x) < \sigma \left| x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, k_r)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, m_r)} \right|$$

holds, and for all odd r, $0 \leq r \leq (n-1)$, we have from $\mathbb{M}(P_2, F_r, H, S_r, \sigma, R, x)$ that

$$\mathbb{L}(F_r, S_r, x) < \sigma \left| x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, k_r)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, m_r)} \right|$$

holds again.

Suppose now that r is even hence $F_r \in \mathbb{K}(P_1, Q_1)$ holds, and $k_r \in S_r$ and $m_r \in \left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_1}, S_r\right) \vdash S_r\right)$ and $S_{r+1} = \mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_1}, S_r\right)$. We shall demonstrate that neither $\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, k_r)$ nor $\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, m_r)$ is a strict subset of any member B of $\mathcal{P}(P_1, S_{r+1})$, or in other words, that neither $\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, k_r)$ nor $\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, m_r)$ is a strict subset of any member B of $\mathcal{P}\left(P_1, \mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{P_1}, S_r\right)\right)$.

Now $P_1 \subseteq F_r$ holds. *Suppose* $\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, k_r)$ is a strict subset of a member B of $\mathcal{P}(P_1, S_{r+1})$. Now $P_1 \subseteq F_r$ holds hence $B \in F_r$ holds. But $\{k_r, m_r\}$ is a member of H, and H is a *partition,* hence $\{k_r, m_r\}$ is the *only* member of H to have k_r as a member, hence $\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, k_r)$ is the *largest* member of F_r to contain k_r but not m_r, hence, since $\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, k_r) \subset B$ implies $k_r \in B$, we must have that $m_r \in B$ holds. But $S_r \in Q_1$ holds and $B \in Q_1$ holds hence S_r does not overlap B, hence since $k_r \in S_r$ holds and $m_r \notin S_r$ holds, we must have that $S_r \subset B$ holds. But then $B \subset S_{r+1}$ contradicts the fact that by definition S_{r+1} is the smallest member of $\overline{P_1}$ to contain S_r.

Now *suppose* $\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, m_r)$ is a strict subset of a member B of $\mathcal{P}(P_1, S_{r+1})$. Then by repeating the same argument with k_r and m_r swapped we again conclude that both k_r and m_r are members of B, hence that $S_r \subset B$ holds, which again with $B \subset S_{r+1}$ contradicts the fact that by definition S_{r+1} is the smallest member of $\overline{P_1}$ to contain S_r.

Hence neither $\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, k_r)$ nor $\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, m_r)$ is a strict subset of any member B of $\mathcal{P}(P_1, S_{r+1})$.

Furthermore, the member $\{k_r, m_r\}$ of H *is* a subset of S_{r+1}, hence $\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, k_r) \subset S_{r+1}$ holds and $\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, m_r) \subset S_{r+1}$ holds, and furthermore, neither $\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, k_r)$ nor $\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, m_r)$ overlaps any member of $\mathcal{P}(P_1, S_{r+1})$. Hence $\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, k_r) \in \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P_1, S_{r+1}))$ holds hence, as shown on page 33, it follows directly from the fact that x is a member of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$, that $x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_r,H,k_r)}$ is a member of the convex hull of the x_E, $E \in \mathcal{P}(P_1, S_{r+1})$, and similarly $\mathcal{Z}(F_r, H, m_r) \in \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P_1, S_{r+1}))$ holds, hence $x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_r,H,m_r)}$ is also a member of the convex hull of the x_E, $E \in \mathcal{P}(P_1, S_{r+1})$.

Hence by Lemma 3,

$$\left| x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_r,H,k_r)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_r,H,m_r)} \right| \leq \mathbb{L}(P_1, S_{r+1}, x)$$

holds. Hence for all even r, $0 \leq r \leq (n-1)$, we have that $\mathbb{L}(F_r, S_r, x) < \sigma \mathbb{L}(P_1, S_{r+1}, x)$ holds.

And by an exactly analogous argument we find that for all odd r, $0 \leq r \leq (n-1)$, that

$$\left| x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_r,H,k_r)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_r,H,m_r)} \right| \leq \mathbb{L}(P_2, S_{r+1}, x)$$

holds, hence that $\mathbb{L}(F_r, S_r, x) < \sigma \mathbb{L}(P_2, S_{r+1}, x)$ holds.

We now select a member G of $\mathbb{K}(P_1, Q_1) \cap \mathbb{K}(P_2, Q_2)$, for example we could take $G = P_1 \cup P_2$.

Let λ be the real number defined by $\lambda \equiv \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - 8\sigma}\right)$, so that $0 < \lambda \leq \frac{1}{5}$ holds.

We note that λ and σ satisfy the equation $\lambda = \frac{\sigma}{1-2\lambda}$, and that $0 < \sigma < \lambda$ holds.

Then by two uses of Lemma 6 (c) for each of the above two inequalities we find that

$$(1-2\lambda)\,\mathbb{L}\left(G, S_r, x\right) \leq \mathbb{L}\left(F_r, S_r, x\right) < \sigma\mathbb{L}\left(P_1, S_{r+1}, x\right) \leq \left(\frac{\sigma}{1-2\lambda}\right)\mathbb{L}\left(G, S_{r+1}, x\right)$$

holds for all r even, $0 \leq r \leq (n-1)$, and that

$$(1-2\lambda)\,\mathbb{L}\left(G, S_r, x\right) \leq \mathbb{L}\left(F_r, S_r, x\right) < \sigma\mathbb{L}\left(P_2, S_{r+1}, x\right) \leq \left(\frac{\sigma}{1-2\lambda}\right)\mathbb{L}\left(G, S_{r+1}, x\right)$$

holds for all odd r, $0 \leq r \leq (n-1)$.

Hence, since $\frac{\sigma}{1-2\lambda} = \lambda$ holds by the definition of λ, we have that

$$\mathbb{L}\left(G, S_r, x\right) \leq \left(\frac{\lambda}{1-2\lambda}\right)\mathbb{L}\left(G, S_{r+1}, x\right)$$

holds for all $0 \leq r \leq (n-1)$.

We further note from the preceding inequalities that $\mathbb{L}\left(F_0, S_0, x\right) < \lambda\mathbb{L}\left(G, S_1, x\right)$ holds, hence for all m such that $1 \leq m \leq n$ holds, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{L}\left(F_0, A, x\right) = \mathbb{L}\left(F_0, S_0, x\right) &< \lambda\mathbb{L}\left(G, S_1, x\right)\\ &\leq \lambda\left(\frac{\lambda}{1-2\lambda}\right)^{m-1}\mathbb{L}\left(G, S_m, x\right)\\ &\leq \left(\frac{\lambda}{1-2\lambda}\right)^{m}\mathbb{L}\left(F_m, S_m, x\right)\end{aligned}$$

holds, where in the last step we made a further use of Lemma 6 (c).

Now let i be any member of A and j be any member of $(S_n \vdash A) = \left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P_1 \cap P_2)}, A\right) \vdash A\right)$ such that $\{i, j\} \in H$ holds.

Suppose that $j \in (S_{m+1} \vdash S_m)$ holds, where $0 \leq m \leq (n-1)$ holds. Then we have, by $\mathbb{M}\left(P_1, F_m, H, S_m, \sigma, R, x\right)$ if m is even, and by $\mathbb{M}\left(P_2, F_m, H, S_m, \sigma, R, x\right)$ if m is odd, that $\mathbb{L}\left(F_m, S_m, x\right) < \sigma\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_m,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_m,H,j)}\right|$ holds.

Now if $m = 0$, then this is the desired result, namely that $\mathbb{L}\left(F_0, A, x\right) < \sigma\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_0,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_0,H,j)}\right|$ holds.

And if $1 \leq m \leq (n-1)$ holds, we use the inequality above to obtain

$$\mathbb{L}\left(F_0, A, x\right) < \sigma\left(\frac{\lambda}{1-2\lambda}\right)^{m}\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_m,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_m,H,j)}\right|,$$

then we use Lemma 6 (e) to obtain

$$\mathbb{L}\left(F_0, A, x\right) < \sigma\left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right)\left(\frac{\lambda}{1-2\lambda}\right)^m \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(G,H,j)}\right|$$

then we use Lemma 6 (e) again to obtain

$$\mathbb{L}\left(F_0, A, x\right) < \sigma\left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right)^2\left(\frac{\lambda}{1-2\lambda}\right)^m \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_0,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_0,H,j)}\right|$$

Now by assumption $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{3}{25}$ holds, hence $0 < \lambda \leq \frac{1}{5}$ holds, hence $0 < \left(\frac{\lambda}{1-2\lambda}\right) \leq \frac{1}{3}$ holds, hence $0 < \left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right)^2\left(\frac{\lambda}{1-2\lambda}\right)^m \leq \frac{25}{27} < 1$ holds for all $m \geq 1$, hence

$$\mathbb{L}\left(F_0, A, x\right) < \sigma\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_0,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F_0,H,j)}\right|$$

holds also for all m such that $m \geq 1$ and $m \leq (n-1)$ both hold.

And this is true for any member i of A and any member j of $\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P_1 \cap P_2)}, A\right) \vdash A\right)$ such that $\{i, j\} \in H$ holds. Hence $\mathbb{M}\left(\left(P_1 \cap P_2\right), F_0, H, A, \sigma, R, x\right)$ holds.

Now $(P_1 \cap P_2) \subseteq P_1 \subseteq F_0 \subseteq Q_1 \subseteq (Q_1 \cup Q_2)$ holds, hence $F_0 \in \mathbb{K}\left(\left(P_1 \cap P_2\right), \left(Q_1 \cup Q_2\right)\right)$ holds.

And if $A \in (Q_2 \vdash P_2)$ holds, then with F_0 now defined to be a member of $\mathbb{K}\left(P_2, Q_2\right)$ such that $\mathbb{M}\left(P_2, F_0, H, A, \sigma, R, x\right)$ holds, we again conclude, by an exactly analogous argument, that $\mathbb{M}\left(\left(P_1 \cap P_2\right), F_0, H, A, \sigma, R, x\right)$ holds.

And $(P_1 \cap P_2) \subseteq P_2 \subseteq F_0 \subseteq Q_2 \subseteq (Q_1 \cup Q_2)$ holds, hence again $F_0 \in \mathbb{K}\left(\left(P_1 \cap P_2\right), \left(Q_1 \cup Q_2\right)\right)$ holds.

Hence if A is any member of $((Q_1 \cup Q_2) \vdash (P_1 \cap P_2))$, then there exists a member F of $\mathbb{K}\left(\left(P_1 \cap P_2\right), \left(Q_1 \cup Q_2\right)\right)$ such that $\mathbb{M}\left(\left(P_1 \cap P_2\right), F, H, A, \sigma, R, x\right)$ holds. Hence $\left(\left(P_1 \cap P_2\right), \left(Q_1 \cup Q_2\right)\right)$ is a member of $\Omega\left(H, \sigma, R, x\right)$.

If (A, B) and (C, D) are ordered pairs of sets such that $A \subseteq B$ holds and $C \subseteq D$ holds, we shall say that (A, B) and (C, D) *link* iff $(A \cup C) \subseteq (B \cap D)$ holds.

We note that if (A, B) and (C, D) are ordered pairs of sets such that $A \subseteq B$ holds and $C \subseteq D$ holds, then (A, B) and (C, D) link iff $\mathbb{K}\left(A, B\right) \cap \mathbb{K}\left(C, D\right) \neq \emptyset$. For if $(A \cup C) \subseteq (B \cap D)$ holds, then $A \subseteq (A \cup C) \subseteq B$ holds and $C \subseteq (A \cup C) \subseteq D$ holds, hence $(A \cup C)$ is a member of both $\mathbb{K}\left(A, B\right)$ and $\mathbb{K}\left(C, D\right)$. And if E is a member of both $\mathbb{K}\left(A, B\right)$ and $\mathbb{K}\left(C, D\right)$, then $A \subseteq E$, $C \subseteq E$, $E \subseteq B$, and $E \subseteq D$ all hold, hence $(A \cup C) \subseteq E \subseteq (B \cap D)$ holds.

We note that linking is *not* an equivalence relation. For if A and B are sets such that $A \subset B$ holds, then (A, A) and (A, B) link, and (A, B) and (B, B) link, but (A, A)

and (B, B) do *not* link, (for if $A \subset B$ holds then (A, A) links (B, B) ifif $B \subseteq A$ holds, which is not the case).

If X is a set such that every member of X is an ordered pair (A, B) of sets such that $A \subseteq B$ holds, we shall say that X is *link-connected* ifif for every partition $\{Y, Z\}$ of X into two nonempty parts Y and Z, there exists a member (A, B) of Y and a member (C, D) of Z such that (A, B) and (C, D) link.

Lemma 8. Let V be any partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, let H be any partition such that if E is any member of H such that E intersects *more* than one member of V, then E has *exactly* two members, let σ be any real number such that $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{3}{25}$ holds, let R be any finite real number > 0, let d be any integer ≥ 1, and let x be any member of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$.

Let X be any nonempty link-connected subset of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$, let P be the map whose domain is X, and such that for each member α of X, P_α is the first component of α, and let Q be the map whose domain is X, and such that for each member α of X, Q_α is the second component of α.

Then $\bigcup_{\alpha \in X} Q_\alpha$ is a wood of V, and $\left(\left(\bigcap_{\alpha \in X} P_\alpha\right), \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in X} Q_\alpha\right)\right)$ is a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$.

Proof. We first show, for any integer r such that $r \geq 1$ and $r \leq (\#(X) - 1)$ both hold, that if there exists an r-member subset Y of X such that $\left(\left(\bigcap_{\alpha \in Y} P_\alpha\right), \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in Y} Q_\alpha\right)\right)$ is a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$, then there exists an $(r+1)$-member subset Z of X such that $\left(\left(\bigcap_{\alpha \in Z} P_\alpha\right), \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in Z} Q_\alpha\right)\right)$ is a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$.

For if r is an integer such that $r \geq 1$ and $r \leq (\#(X) - 1)$ both hold, and Y is an r-member subset of X such that $\left(\left(\bigcap_{\alpha \in Y} P_\alpha\right), \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in Y} Q_\alpha\right)\right)$ is a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$, then the fact that X is link-connected, together with the facts that Y and $(X \vdash Y)$ are nonempty, imply that there exists a member β of Y and a member γ of $(X \vdash Y)$ such that β links γ, or in other words such that $(P_\beta \cup P_\gamma) \subseteq (Q_\beta \cap Q_\gamma)$ holds.

Now $\left(\bigcap_{\alpha \in Y} P_\alpha\right) \cup P_\gamma \subseteq P_\beta \cup P_\gamma$ and $Q_\beta \cap Q_\gamma \subseteq \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in Y} Q_\alpha\right) \cap Q_\gamma$ both hold by the fundamental properties of sets, hence $\left(\bigcap_{\alpha \in Y} P_\alpha\right) \cup P_\gamma \subseteq P_\beta \cup P_\gamma \subseteq Q_\beta \cap Q_\gamma \subseteq \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in Y} Q_\alpha\right) \cap Q_\gamma$ holds, hence $\left(\bigcap_{\alpha \in Y} P_\alpha\right) \cup P_\gamma \subseteq \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in Y} Q_\alpha\right) \cap Q_\gamma$ holds, hence, defining $Z \equiv Y \cup \{\gamma\}$, we have, from Lemma 7, that $\left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in Z} Q_\alpha\right)$ is a wood of V, and $\left(\left(\bigcap_{\alpha \in Z} P_\alpha\right), \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in Z} Q_\alpha\right)\right)$ is a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$.

Now the assumption that X is a subset of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ implies directly that if Y is any *one-member* subset of X, then $\left(\left(\bigcap_{\alpha \in Y} P_\alpha\right), \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in Y} Q_\alpha\right)\right)$ is a member of

$\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$, for if $Y = \{\beta\}$, then $\left(\bigcap_{\alpha \in Y} P_\alpha\right) = P_\beta$ and $\left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in Y} Q_\alpha\right) = Q_\beta$.

And the assumption that X is nonempty implies that X has at least one one-member subset. Hence it follows directly, by induction, that if r is any integer such that $1 \leq r \leq \#(X)$ holds, then there exists an r-member subset Y of X such that $\bigcup_{\alpha \in Y} Q_\alpha$ is a wood of V, and $\left(\left(\bigcap_{\alpha \in Y} P_\alpha\right), \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in Y} Q_\alpha\right)\right)$ is a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$.

But the only $\#(X)$-member subset of X is X itself, hence $\bigcup_{\alpha \in X} Q_\alpha$ is a wood of V, and $\left(\left(\bigcap_{\alpha \in X} P_\alpha\right), \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in X} Q_\alpha\right)\right)$ is a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$.

We recall from page 20 that if X is any set such that every member of X is an ordered pair, then we define $\mathcal{D}(X)$ to be the set whose members are all the first components of members of X, and we define $\mathcal{R}(X)$ to be the set whose members are all the second components of members of X.

And we recall from page 21 that if F is any set such that every member of F is itself a set, then we define $\mathcal{U}(F)$ to be the union of all the members of F, and we also recall from page 21 that if G is any *nonempty* set such that every member of G is itself a set, then we define $\mathcal{I}(G)$ to be the intersection of all the members of G.

Thus if X is any nonempty set such that every member of X is an ordered pair, and P is defined to be the map whose domain is X, and such that for each member α of X, P_α is the first component of α, and Q is defined to be the map whose domain is X, and such that for each member α of X, Q_α is the second component of α, then $\left(\bigcap_{\alpha \in X} P_\alpha\right) = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}(X))$ holds and $\left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in X} Q_\alpha\right) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(X))$ holds.

Hence Lemma 8 can be restated as follows: Let V, H, σ, R, d, and x be as in Lemmas 7 and 8, and let X be any nonempty link-connected subset of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$. Then $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(X))$ is a wood of V, and $(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}(X)), \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(X)))$ is a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$.

If X is a set such that every member of X is an ordered pair (A, B) of sets such that $A \subseteq B$ holds, then a *link-connected component of* X is a nonempty subset Y of X such that Y is link-connected and Y is *not* a strict subset of any link-connected subset of X.

Now given any set X such that every member of X is an ordered pair (A, B) of sets such that $A \subseteq B$ holds, we may define U to be the set whose members are all the two-member subsets $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ of X such that α links β. Then if Y is any subset of X, Y is link-connected ifif Y is U-connected, for if $\{J, K\}$ is any partition of Y into two nonempty parts J and K, then there exists a member α of J and a member β of K such that α links β ifif there exists a member $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ of U such that $J \cap \{\alpha, \beta\}$ and

$K \cap \{\alpha, \beta\}$ are both nonempty. Hence we may conclude directly from Lemma 2 that if F is the set whose members are all the link-connected components of X, then F is a partition of X.

And in particular we may conclude that if V, H, σ, R, d, and x are as in Lemmas 7 and 8, and F is the set whose members are all the link-connected components of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$, then F is a partition of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$.

If d is any integer ≥ 1 and V is any partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, then for every ordered quadruple (H, σ, R, x) of a partition H, a real number σ such that $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{1}{8}$ holds, a finite real number $R > 0$, and a member x of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$, we define $\Delta(H, \sigma, R, x)$ to be the set whose members are the ordered pairs $(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}(X)), \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(X)))$ corresponding to all the link-connected components X of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$. Then it immediately follows from Lemma 8 that if V, H, σ, R, d, and x are as in Lemmas 7 and 8, then $\Delta(H, \sigma, R, x)$ is a subset of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$.

Now it immediately follows from Lemma 1 that if U is any set such that every member of U is a set, and A and B are any U-connected sets such that there exists a member E of U such that E intersects both A and B, then $A \cup B$ is a U-connected set. For let E be any member of U such that E intersects both A and B. Then the set $E \cap (A \cup B)$ is certainly U-connected, for if $\{J, K\}$ is any partition of this set into two nonempty parts then the member E of U intersects both parts, and furthermore, this set intersects both A and B. Hence by one application of Lemma 1 we find that the set $A \cup (E \cap (A \cup B))$ is U-connected, and then by a second application of Lemma 1 we find that the set $B \cup A \cup (E \cap (A \cup B))$ is U-connected. But $(E \cap (A \cup B))$ is a subset of $A \cup B$, hence $B \cup A \cup (E \cap (A \cup B))$ is equal to $A \cup B$.

And from this it immediately follows that if A is a set, U is a set such that every member of U is a set, and B and C are any two *distinct* U-connected components of A, then there is *no* member E of U such that E intersects both B and C, for if there was such a member E of U, then $B \cup C$ would be U-connected, and both B and C would be strict subsets of the U-connected subset $B \cup C$ of A.

Now let V, H, σ, R, d, and x be as in Lemmas 7 and 8, so that $\Delta(H, \sigma, R, x)$ is a subset of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$, and let (P, Q) and (S, T) be any two *distinct* members of $\Delta(H, \sigma, R, x)$. Then (P, Q) and (S, T) are members of *distinct* link-connected components of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$, hence it immediately follows from the above paragraph that (P, Q) and (S, T) do *not* link. And this means, as shown on page 48, that $\mathbb{K}(P, Q) \cap \mathbb{K}(S, T)$ is empty.

We recall from page 36 that for any ordered pair (V,H) of a partition V such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V)\geq 2$ holds, and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathcal{G}(V,H)$ to be the set whose members are all the woods F of V such that every member A of F is $(V\cup H)$-connected.

Now let V, H, σ, R, d, and x be as in Lemmas 7 and 8, and let F be any member of $\mathcal{G}(V,H)$. Then as observed on page 37, it immediately follows from the definition of $\Omega(H,\sigma,R,x)$, that the ordered pair (F,F) is a member of $\Omega(H,\sigma,R,x)$. And as shown above, the set whose members are all the link-connected components of $\Omega(H,\sigma,R,x)$, is a *partition* of $\Omega(H,\sigma,R,x)$, hence there exists a *unique* link-connected component X of $\Omega(H,\sigma,R,x)$ such that $(F,F)\in X$ holds. Let X be the unique link-connected component of $\Omega(H,\sigma,R,x)$ such that $(F,F)\in X$ holds. Then $(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}(X)),\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(X)))$ is a member of $\Delta(H,\sigma,R,x)$ and a member of $\Omega(H,\sigma,R,x)$ and, since it immediately follows from $(F,F)\in X$ that $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}(X))\subseteq F\subseteq\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(X))$ holds, F is a member of $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}(X)),\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(X)))$. And by the foregoing, if (P,Q) and (S,T) are any two *distinct* members of $\Delta(H,\sigma,R,x)$, then $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)\cap\mathbb{K}(S,T)=\emptyset$. Hence if (P,Q) is any member of $\Delta(H,\sigma,R,x)$ such that (P,Q) is *not* equal to $(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}(X)),\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(X)))$, then F is *not* a member of $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$.

Hence if V, H, σ, R, d, and x are as in Lemmas 7 and 8, and F is any member of $\mathcal{G}(V,H)$, then there exists exactly one member (P,Q) of $\Delta(H,\sigma,R,x)$, specifically the member $(P,Q)=(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}(X)),\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(X)))$, where X is the unique link-connected component of $\Omega(H,\sigma,R,x)$ such that $(F,F)\in X$ holds, such that $F\in\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$ holds.

Furthermore, if V, H, σ, R, d, and x are as in Lemmas 7 and 8, and (P,Q) is any member of $\Delta(H,\sigma,R,x)$, then (P,Q) is a member of $\Omega(H,\sigma,R,x)$, hence every member F of $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$ is a member of $\mathcal{G}(V,H)$

Hence if V, H, σ, R, d, and x are as in Lemmas 7 and 8, and Z is defined to be the set whose members are the sets $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$, where (P,Q) is a member of $\Delta(H,\sigma,R,x)$, then Z is a *partition* of $\mathcal{G}(V,H)$.

For any ordered pair (V,H) of a partition V such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V)\geq 2$ holds, and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathcal{N}(V,H)$ to be the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (F,G) of members F and G of $\mathcal{G}(V,H)$ such that $F\subseteq G$ holds.

If (H,σ,R,x) is an ordered quadruple such that $\Omega(H,\sigma,R,x)$ is defined and such that $V=\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}(x))$, H, σ, R, d, (determined from x as the number of components of any member of $\mathcal{R}(x)$), and x satisfy the conditions of Lemmas 7 and 8, we shall say that a member (P, Q) of $\mathcal{N}(V, H)$ *generates a good set of woods for* (H, σ, R, x) ifif (P, Q) is a member of $\Delta(H, \sigma, R, x)$, and we shall say a subset X of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$ is a *good set of woods for* (H, σ, R, x) ifif X has the form $\mathbb{K}(P, Q)$, where (P, Q) is a member of $\Delta(H, \sigma, R, x)$.

If V, H, σ, R, and d are as in Lemmas 7 and 8, then we shall partition the set of all ordered pairs (F, x) of a member F of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$ and a member x of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$ into a finite number of sectors, the sectors being in one-to-one correspondence with some subset of $\mathcal{N}(V, H)$, such that the sector associated with the member (P, Q) of $\mathcal{N}(V, H)$ is the set of all ordered pairs (F, x) of a member F of $\mathbb{K}(P, Q)$ and a member x of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$ such that (P, Q) generates a good set of woods for (H, σ, R, x).

We note that the number of sectors is less than the square of the total number of woods of V, which is itself less than $2^{\left(2^{\#(V)}\right)}$.

Now let V, H, σ, R, d, and x be as in Lemmas 7 and 8, and let F be any member of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$. Then to identify the unique member (P, Q) of $\Delta(H, \sigma, R, x)$ such that $F \in \mathbb{K}(P, Q)$ holds, we define Y to be the set whose members are all the members (S, T) of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ such that $S \subseteq F \subseteq T$ holds, or in other words such that $F \in \mathbb{K}(S, T)$ holds. Then Lemma 8 guarantees that there exists a unique member (J, K) of Y such that $J \subseteq S \subseteq T \subseteq K$ holds for every member (S, T) of Y, for $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}(Y)) \subseteq S \subseteq T \subseteq \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(Y))$ certainly holds for every member (S, T) of Y, and by Lemma 8 the ordered pair $(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}(Y)), \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(Y)))$ is a member of Y, and furthermore if (J, K) and (M, N) are members of Y such that $J \subseteq S \subseteq T \subseteq K$ holds for every member (S, T) of Y and $M \subseteq S \subseteq T \subseteq N$ holds for every member (S, T) of Y, then $J \subseteq M$ and $M \subseteq J$ both hold hence $M = J$ holds, and $N \subseteq K$ and $K \subseteq N$ both hold, hence $N = K$ holds, hence the member $(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}(Y)), \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(Y)))$ is the *only* member (J, K) of Y such that $J \subseteq S \subseteq T \subseteq K$ holds for every member (S, T) of Y. Now by definition $\Delta(H, \sigma, R, x)$ is the set whose members are the ordered pairs $(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}(X)), \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(X)))$ corresponding to all the link-connected components X of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$, and by Lemma 8, every member of $\Delta(H, \sigma, R, x)$ is a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$, which as shown above, implies that no two distinct members of $\Delta(H, \sigma, R, x)$ link, hence that if (J, K) and (M, N) are any two distinct members of $\Delta(H, \sigma, R, x)$ then $\mathbb{K}(J, K) \cap \mathbb{K}(M, N)$ is empty. Now let X be the unique link-connected component of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ that has (F, F) as a member. Then $(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}(X)), \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(X)))$ is a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ by Lemma 8 and $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}(X)) \subseteq F \subseteq \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(X))$ holds, hence $(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}(X)), \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(X)))$ is a member of Y. And $Y \cap X$ has the member (F, F) hence is nonempty, hence by Lemma

1, $Y \cup X$ is link-connected, hence Y is a subset of X since X is a link-connected *component* of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$. Hence $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}(X)) \subseteq S \subseteq T \subseteq \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(X))$ holds for every member (S, T) of Y, hence $(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}(X)), \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(X)))$ is equal to $(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}(Y)), \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(Y)))$.

We note that if V, H, σ, R, d, and x are as in Lemmas 7 and 8, and (P, Q) and (S, T) are any two distinct members of $\Delta(H, \sigma, R, x)$, then it immediately follows from the fact that (P, Q) and (S, T) do *not* link, that $P \neq S$ holds and $Q \neq T$ holds.

Lemma 9. Let V be any partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, let H be any partition such that if E is any member of H such that E intersects *more* than one member of V, then E has *exactly* two members, let σ be any real number such that $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{3}{25}$ holds, let R be any finite real number > 0, let d be any integer ≥ 1, and let x be any member of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$.

Then the member (P, Q) of $\mathcal{N}(V, H)$ generates a good set of woods for (H, σ, R, x) ifif both the following conditions (i) and (ii) hold.

(i) $(P, Q) \in \Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ holds.

(ii) For all $(F, G) \in \mathcal{N}(V, H)$ such that $F \subseteq P$ and $Q \subseteq G$ both hold, and $(F, G) \neq (P, Q)$, (F, G) is *not* a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$.

Proof. We note first that (i) is certainly necessary for (P, Q) to generate a good set of woods at x. And (ii) is also necessary, for if $F \subseteq P$ and $Q \subseteq G$ both hold, and $(F, G) \neq (P, Q)$, then $(F \cup P) \subseteq (G \cap Q)$ holds, hence (F, G) links (P, Q), but at least one of $P \subseteq F$ and $G \subseteq Q$ is false. Hence if (P, Q) generates a good set of woods for (H, σ, R, x), then (F, G) cannot be a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ for if (P, Q) generates a good set of woods for (H, σ, R, x), then $P \subseteq J \subseteq K \subseteq Q$ holds for every member (J, K) of the link-connected component of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ that contains (P, Q).

Now let X be the subset of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ whose members are all the members (J, K) of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ such that $P \subseteq J \subseteq K \subseteq Q$ holds. We shall show that (i) and (ii) imply that X is the link-connected component of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ to which (P, Q) belongs.

We first note that, since $P \subseteq J \subseteq K \subseteq Q$ implies that $(J \cup P) \subseteq (K \cap Q)$ holds, every member (J, K) of X is *linked* to (P, Q), hence X is certainly link-connected.

Now suppose X is a strict subset of Z, where Z is a link-connected subset of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$. Consider the partition of Z into X and the nonempty set $(Z \vdash X)$. Then the assumption that Z is link-connected implies that there exists $(J, K) \in X$ and $(F, G) \in (Z \vdash X)$ such that (J, K) links (F, G). And (P, Q) links (J, K), hence

$\{(P, Q), (J, K), (F, G)\}$ is a link-connected subset of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$, hence, by Lemma 8, $((P \cap J \cap F), (Q \cup K \cup G)) \in \Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ holds. Now $(P \cap J \cap F) \subseteq P$ holds, and $Q \subseteq (Q \cup K \cup G)$ holds. And by assumption, $P \subseteq F \subseteq G \subseteq Q$ does *not* hold, since (F, G) is not a member of X. Hence at least one of $(P \vdash F)$ and $(G \vdash Q)$ is nonempty, hence at least one of $(P \vdash (P \cap J \cap F))$ and $((Q \cup K \cup G) \vdash Q)$ is nonempty, hence $((P \cap J \cap F), (Q \cup K \cup G))$ is not equal to (P, Q). Hence (ii) implies that $((P \cap J \cap F), (Q \cup K \cup G))$ cannot be a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$, which contradicts the conclusion drawn from the assumption that $(F, G) \in \Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ holds. Hence (ii) implies that (F, G) cannot be a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$.

Hence (i) and (ii) imply that X is the link-connected component of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ that contains (P, Q).

Lemma 10. Let V be any partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, let H be any partition such that if E is any member of H such that E intersects *more* than one member of V, then E has *exactly* two members, let σ be any real number such that $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{3}{25}$ holds, let R be any finite real number > 0, let d be any integer ≥ 1, and let x be any member of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$.

Let (P, Q) generate a good set of woods for (H, σ, R, x), and let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}(P)$. Then $\mathbb{M}((P \vdash \{A\}), P, H, A, \sigma, R, x)$ does *not* hold.

Proof. Suppose that $\mathbb{M}((P \vdash \{A\}), P, H, A, \sigma, R, x)$ does hold. We shall prove that this would imply that for every member B of $(Q \vdash (P \vdash \{A\}))$, there exists a member F of $\mathbb{K}((P \vdash \{A\}), Q)$ such that $\mathbb{M}((P \vdash \{A\}), F, H, B, \sigma, R, x)$ holds, hence that $((P \vdash \{A\}), Q)$ is a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$, which by Lemma 9 contradicts the assumption that (P, Q) generates a good set of woods for (H, σ, R, x).

For suppose first that B is a member of $(Q \vdash P)$. Then the assumption that (P, Q) generates a good set of woods for (H, σ, R, x) implies that there exists a member F of $\mathbb{K}(P, Q)$ such that $\mathbb{M}(P, F, H, B, \sigma, R, x)$ holds. Let F be a member of $\mathbb{K}(P, Q)$ such that $\mathbb{M}(P, F, H, B, \sigma, R, x)$ holds. Then $\mathbb{L}(F, B, x) < R$ holds, and for all $i \in B$ and $j \in \left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right) \vdash B\right)$ such that $\{i, j\} \in H$ holds, $\mathbb{L}(F, B, x) < \sigma \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|$ holds. Now if $\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \vdash \{A\})}, B\right)$ is equal to $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$, then this implies directly that $\mathbb{M}((P \vdash \{A\}), F, H, B, \sigma, R, x)$ holds.

Suppose now that $\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \vdash \{A\})}, B\right)$ is *not* equal to $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$. Now by definition $\bar{P} \equiv (P \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\})$, and $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$ is the *smallest* member C of $\bar{P}$ such that $B \subseteq C$ holds, hence $\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \vdash \{A\})}, B\right)$ is equal to $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$ unless $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$ is not a member of $\overline{(P \vdash \{A\})}$, or in other words, unless $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right) = A$. Hence the assumption that $\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \vdash \{A\})}, B\right)$ is not equal to $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$ implies that $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right) = A$. And the assumption that $\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \vdash \{A\})}, B\right)$ is not equal to $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$ also implies that A is not equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$, for if $A = \mathcal{U}(V)$ then $\overline{(P \vdash \{A\})}$ is equal to $\bar{P}$. Let i be any member of B and j be any member of $\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \vdash \{A\})}, B\right) \vdash \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)\right)$ such that $\{i, j\} \in H$ holds. Now $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$ is equal to A, and furthermore, $\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \vdash \{A\})}, B\right)$ is equal to $\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \vdash \{A\})}, \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)\right)$, hence $\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \vdash \{A\})}, B\right)$ is equal to $\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \vdash \{A\})}, A\right)$. Hence j is a member of $\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \vdash \{A\})}, A\right) \vdash A\right)$, hence the assumption that $\mathbb{M}\left((P \vdash \{A\}), P, H, A, \sigma, R, x\right)$ holds, implies that $\mathbb{L}(P, A, x) < \sigma \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}\right|$ holds. Let F be a member of $\mathbb{K}(P, Q)$ such that $\mathbb{M}(P, F, H, B, \sigma, R, x)$ holds. Now A is a member of P, hence A is $(V \cup H)$-connected, and B is a member of $(Q \vdash P)$, hence B is a *strict* subset of $A = \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$, hence there exists a member k of B and a member m of $(A \vdash B)$ such that $\{k, m\} \in H$ holds. Let k be a member of B and m be a member of $(A \vdash B)$ such that $\{k, m\} \in H$ holds. Then by $\mathbb{M}(P, F, H, B, \sigma, R, x)$, $\mathbb{L}(F, B, x) < \sigma \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,k)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,m)}\right|$ holds. Now $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, k)$ is a subset of A, and is *not* a strict subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, for $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right) = A$ implies that B is *not* a subset of $\mathcal{K}(P, A, k)$, (which by definition is the unique member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ that has k as a member), hence $\mathcal{K}(P, A, k) \subset B$ holds, hence m is *not* a member of $\mathcal{K}(P, A, k)$, hence since H is a *partition,* hence $\{k, m\}$ is the *only* member of H that has k as a member, $\mathcal{K}(P, A, k) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(F, H, k)$ holds since $\mathcal{K}(P, A, k)$ is a member of F. Hence if $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, k)$ was a strict subset of a member C of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ then $\mathcal{K}(P, A, k) \subset C$ would hold, which is impossible since $\mathcal{K}(P, A, k)$ is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$. And furthermore $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, k)$ overlaps no member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, hence $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, k)$ is a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$, hence as shown on page 33, $x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,k)}$ is a member of the convex hull of the x_C, $C \in \mathcal{P}(P, A)$. And $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, m)$ is a subset of A, and is *not* a strict subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, for as just shown, m is *not* a member of $\mathcal{K}(P, A, k)$, hence $\mathcal{K}(P, A, k)$ is not equal to $\mathcal{K}(P, A, m)$, hence k is not a member of $\mathcal{K}(P, A, m)$, hence since H is a *partition,* hence $\{k, m\}$ is the *only* member of H that has m as a member, $\mathcal{K}(P, A, m) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(F, H, m)$ holds since $\mathcal{K}(P, A, m)$ is a member of F, hence the fact that $\mathcal{K}(P, A, m)$ is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ implies that $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, m)$ cannot be a strict subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$. And furthermore, $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, m)$ overlaps no member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, hence $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, m)$ is a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$, hence as shown on page 33, $x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,m)}$ is a member of the convex hull of the x_C, $C \in \mathcal{P}(P, A)$. Hence by Lemma 3, $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,k)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,m)}\right| < \mathbb{L}(P, A, x)$ holds, hence $\mathbb{L}(F, B, x) < \sigma \mathbb{L}(P, A, x)$ holds, hence $\mathbb{L}(F, B, x) < \sigma^2 \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}\right|$ holds hence, by Lemma 6 (e), $\mathbb{L}(F, B, x) < \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{1-2\lambda}\right) \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|$ holds, where λ is the real number defined by $\lambda \equiv \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - 8\sigma}\right)$, so that $0 < \lambda \leq \frac{1}{5}$ holds since $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{3}{25}$ holds. Now λ and σ satisfy the equation $\lambda = \frac{\sigma}{1-2\lambda}$, and $0 < \lambda < 1$ holds, hence $\mathbb{L}(F, B, x) < \sigma \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|$ holds.

Hence $\mathbb{L}(F, B, x) < \sigma \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|$ holds for all $i \in B$ and *all* $j \in \left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \vdash \{A\})}, B\right) \vdash B\right)$, hence $\mathbb{M}((P \vdash \{A\}), F, H, B, \sigma, R, x)$ holds in this case also.

And finally, for the case $B = A$, $\mathbb{M}((P \vdash \{A\}), P, H, A, \sigma, R, x)$ holds by assumption.

Hence the assumption that $\mathbb{M}((P \vdash \{A\}), P, H, A, \sigma, R, x)$ holds implies that for every member B of $(Q \vdash (P \vdash \{A\}))$, there exists a member F of $\mathbb{K}((P \vdash \{A\}), Q)$ such that $\mathbb{M}((P \vdash \{A\}), F, H, B, \sigma, R, x)$ holds, hence that $((P \vdash \{A\}), Q)$ is a member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$. And by Lemma 9, this contradicts the assumption that (P, Q) generates a good set of woods for (H, σ, R, x).

Lemma 11. Let V be any partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, let H be any partition such that if E is any member of H such that E intersects *more* than one member of V, then E has *exactly* two members, let σ be any real number such that $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{3}{25}$ holds, let R be any finite real number > 0, let d be any integer ≥ 1, and let x be any member of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$.

Let (P, Q) be any member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ such that there is *no* member (P, G) of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$ such that $Q \subset G$ holds, let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$, let X be any σ-cluster of $\downarrow(x, \mathcal{P}(P, A))$ such that $\#(X) \geq 2$ holds, and X is *not* equal to $\mathcal{D}(\downarrow(x, \mathcal{P}(P, A))) = \mathcal{P}(P, A)$, and let B be any $(V \cup H)$-connected component of $\mathcal{U}(X)$ such that B is *not* a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, and such that $\mathbb{L}(P, B, x) < R$ holds.

Then B is a member of $(Q \vdash P)$.

Proof. We first note that by the definition of a σ-cluster of $\downarrow(x, \mathcal{P}(P, A))$ and the assumption that $\#(X) \geq 2$ holds, X is a subset of $\mathcal{D}(\downarrow(x, \mathcal{P}(P, A))) = \mathcal{P}(P, A)$ such that $\#(X) \geq 2$ holds and such that for every $I \in X$, $J \in X$, $K \in X$, and $M \in (\mathcal{P}(P, A) \vdash X)$, $|x_I - x_J| < \sigma |x_K - x_M|$ holds.

Now if C is any member of X, then either $C \subseteq B$ holds or $C \cap B = \emptyset$ holds. For each member of X is a member of P hence is $(V \cup H)$-connected, and by assumption B is a $(V \cup H)$-connected component of X, hence is $(V \cup H)$-connected. Thus if $(C \vdash B)$ and $(C \cap B)$ were both nonempty, then by Lemma 1, $(C \cup B)$ would be a $(V \cup H)$-connected subset of $\mathcal{U}(X)$ such that $B \subset (C \cup B)$ holds, which contradicts the assumption that B is a $(V \cup H)$-connected *component* of $\mathcal{U}(X)$.

Furthermore, B is a nonempty subset of A, and if C is any member of $(\mathcal{P}(P, A) \vdash X)$, then $C \cap B = \emptyset$ holds.

Hence B is a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$, and since by assumption B is *not* a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, B is a member of $(\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(P, A))$, hence every member C of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ such that $C \subseteq B$ holds, is a *strict* subset of B.

Now let C be any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, B)$. Then C is a member of P such that $C \subset A$ holds hence, as shown on page 23, there is a unique member E of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ such that $C \subseteq E$ holds. Let E be the unique member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ such that $C \subseteq E$ holds. Then E is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ such that $E \cap B$ is nonempty hence, by the foregoing, $E \subset B$ holds, hence $C \subset E$ cannot hold, (for if $C \subset E$ held then E would be a member of P such that $C \subset E \subset B$ held, contradicting $C \in \mathcal{P}(P, B)$), hence $C = E$ holds, hence C is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, hence since C is a subset of B hence a subset of $\mathcal{U}(X)$ hence cannot be a member of $(\mathcal{P}(P, A) \vdash X)$, C is a member of X.

Hence $\mathcal{P}(P, B)$ is a subset of X, hence since $\mathbb{L}(P, B, x)$ is by definition equal to $\max\limits_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{P}(P,B) \\ J \in \mathcal{P}(P,B)}} |x_I - x_J|$, the inequality $\mathbb{L}(P, B, x) \leq \max\limits_{\substack{I \in X \\ J \in X}} |x_I - x_J|$ holds. Furthermore, by assumption, $\mathbb{L}(P, B, x) < R$ holds.

Now let i be any member of B and j be any member of $\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right) \vdash B\right)$ such that $\{i, j\}$ is a member of H. Now $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right) \subseteq A$ certainly holds, for $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$ is by definition the *smallest* member D of $\bar{P}$ such that $B \subseteq D$ holds, and A is a member of $\bar{P}$ such that $B \subseteq A$ holds. Hence j is a member of A, hence j is a member of $(A \vdash B)$. And furthermore, j is not a member of $\mathcal{U}(X)$, for if j was a member of $\mathcal{U}(X)$, then j would be a member of some member C of X such that C is *not* a subset of B, hence as shown on page 52, the facts that B and C are $(V \cup H)$-connected, together with the fact that $\{i, j\}$ is a member of H, would imply by Lemma 1 that $(C \cup B)$ is $(V \cup H)$-connected, which together with the fact that C is *not* a subset of B, hence that B is a *strict* subset of $(C \cup B)$, contradicts the fact that B is a $(V \cup H)$-connected *component* of $\mathcal{U}(X)$.

Now $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$, which by definition is the unique member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ that has i as a member, is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ that intersects $\mathcal{U}(X)$, (since i is a member of $\mathcal{U}(X)$), hence is a member of X, and j is not a member of $\mathcal{U}\left(X\right)$, hence $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,j\right)$, which is the unique member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)$ that has j as a member, is not a subset of $\mathcal{U}\left(X\right)$, hence $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,j\right)$ is not a member of X, hence $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,j\right)$ is a member of $\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\vdash X\right)$.

Hence $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,j\right)$ is not equal to $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right)$, hence j is not a member of $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right)$, hence $\{i,j\}$ is not a subset of $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right)$, hence since H is a *partition,* hence $\{i,j\}$ is the *only* member of H that has i as a member, $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right)$ is a subset of $\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,i\right)$, which by definition is the *largest* member of P that has i as a member but does not contain as a subset any member of H that has i as a member. Furthermore $\{i,j\}$ *is* a subset of A, and since $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right)$ is a member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)$, there is *no* member C of P such that $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right)\subset C\subset A$ holds, hence $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right)$ is the *largest* member of P that has i as a member but does not contain as a subset any member of H that has i as a member, hence $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right)=\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,i\right)$ holds.

And by an exactly analogous argument, $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,j\right)=\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,j\right)$ holds.

Hence $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}-x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}\right|$ is equal to $\left|x_{\mathcal{K}(P,A,i)}-x_{\mathcal{K}(P,A,j)}\right|$ hence since, as shown above, $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right)$ is a member of X and $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,j\right)$ is a member of $\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\vdash X\right)$, the inequality $\min\limits_{\substack{K\in X\\ M\in(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash X)}}\left|x_K-x_M\right|\leq\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}-x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}\right|$ holds, hence by the fact that X is a σ-cluster of $\downarrow\left(x,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$ such that $\#\left(X\right)\geq 2$ holds,

$$\mathbb{L}\left(P,B,x\right)\leq\max_{\substack{I\in X\\ J\in X}}\left|x_I-x_J\right|<\sigma\min_{\substack{K\in X\\ M\in(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash X)}}\left|x_K-x_M\right|\leq\sigma\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}-x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}\right|$$

holds, hence $\mathbb{L}\left(P,B,x\right)<\sigma\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}-x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}\right|$ holds.

Hence $\mathbb{M}\left(P,P,H,B,\sigma,R,x\right)$ holds.

Now by assumption $\left(P,Q\right)$ is a member of $\Omega\left(H,\sigma,R,x\right)$, hence for every member C of $\left(Q\vdash P\right)$, there exists a member F of $\mathbb{K}\left(P,Q\right)$ such that $\mathbb{M}\left(P,F,H,C,\sigma,R,x\right)$ holds. Hence if B was *not* a member of $\left(Q\vdash P\right)$, then for every member C of $\left(\left(Q\cup\{B\}\right)\vdash P\right)$ there would exist a member F of $\mathbb{K}\left(P,\left(Q\cup\{B\}\right)\right)$ such that $\mathbb{M}\left(P,F,H,C,\sigma,R,x\right)$ holds, hence $\left(P,\left(Q\cup\{B\}\right)\right)$ would be a member of $\Omega\left(H,\sigma,R,x\right)$.

But by assumption there is *no* member $\left(P,G\right)$ of $\Omega\left(H,\sigma,R,x\right)$ such that $Q\subset G$ holds. Hence B must be a member of $\left(Q\vdash P\right)$.

Additional Note to Lemma 11. $\mathbb{M}\left(P,P,H,\mathcal{U}\left(V\right),\sigma,R,x\right)$ holds whenever $\mathbb{L}\left(P,\mathcal{U}\left(V\right),x\right)<R$ holds, hence with the same assumptions on $\left(P,Q\right)$ as in Lemma 11, $\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)\in\left(Q\vdash P\right)$ holds whenever $\mathbb{L}\left(P,\mathcal{U}\left(V\right),x\right)<R$ holds.

We recall from page 26 that for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we define $\mathbb{T}\left(s\right)$ by

$$\mathbb{T}\left(s\right) \equiv \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s < 0 \text{ holds} \\ 0 & \text{if } s \geq 0 \text{ holds} \end{cases}$$

For every ordered septuple $(P, F, H, A, \sigma, R, x)$ of a wood P, a wood F such that $\mathcal{M}\left(F\right) = \mathcal{M}\left(P\right)$ holds and $P \subseteq F$ holds, a partition H, a member A of $\left(\Xi\left(\mathcal{M}\left(P\right)\right) \vdash \mathcal{M}\left(P\right)\right)$, a real number σ such that $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{1}{8}$ holds, a finite real number $R > 0$, and a member x of $\mathbb{F}_d\left(\mathcal{M}\left(P\right)\right)$, where d is an integer ≥ 1, we define the number $\tilde{\mathbb{M}}\left(P, F, H, A, \sigma, R, x\right)$ to be equal to 1 if $\mathbb{M}\left(P, F, H, A, \sigma, R, x\right)$ holds, and to be equal to 0 otherwise.

And for every ordered triple (A, B, H) of a set A, a set B such that $A \subseteq B$ holds, and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathbb{Q}\left(A, B, H\right)$ to be the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (i, j) of a member i of A and a member j of $\left(B \vdash A\right)$ such that $\{i, j\}$ is a member of H.

Now the proposition $\mathbb{M}\left(P, F, H, A, \sigma, R, x\right)$ can be expressed as:

For all $S \in \mathcal{P}\left(F, A\right)$ and all $T \in \mathcal{P}\left(F, A\right)$, $\left|x_S - x_T\right| < R$ holds, and for all $i \in A$ and all $j \in \left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, A\right) \vdash A\right)$ such that $\{i, j\}$ is a member of H, and for all $S \in \mathcal{P}\left(F, A\right)$ and all $T \in \mathcal{P}\left(F, A\right)$, $\left|x_S - x_T\right| < \sigma\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|$ holds.

Hence $\tilde{\mathbb{M}}\left(P, F, H, A, \sigma, R, x\right)$ may be constructed as:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{M}}\left(P, F, H, A, \sigma, R, x\right) = \left(\prod_{\Delta \equiv \{S,T\} \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(F,A))} \mathbb{T}\left(\left|x_S - x_T\right| - R\right)\right) \times$$

$$\times \left(\prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Q}\left(A, \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, A\right), H\right) \\ \Delta \equiv \{S,T\} \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(F,A))}} \mathbb{T}\left(\left|x_S - x_T\right| - \sigma\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|\right)\right)$$

For any ordered sextuple (P, Q, H, σ, R, x) of a wood P, a wood Q such that $\mathcal{M}\left(Q\right) = \mathcal{M}\left(P\right)$ holds and $P \subseteq Q$ holds, a partition H such that if E is any member of H such that E intersects *more* than one member of $\mathcal{M}\left(P\right)$, then E has *exactly* two members, a real number σ such that $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{3}{25}$ holds, a real number $R > 0$, and a member x of $\mathbb{F}_d\left(\mathcal{M}\left(P\right)\right)$, where d is an integer ≥ 1, we define the real numbers $\mathcal{L}\left(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x\right)$, $\mathcal{H}\left(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x\right)$, and $\mathcal{E}\left(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x\right)$ by:

$\mathcal{L}\left(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x\right)$ is equal to 1 if (P, Q) is a member of $\Omega\left(H, \sigma, R, x\right)$, and equal to 0 otherwise,

$\mathcal{H}(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x)$ is equal to 1 if (P,Q) is a member of $\Omega(H,\sigma,R,x)$ such that there is *no* member (P,G) of $\Omega(H,\sigma,R,x)$ such that $G\subset Q$ holds, and equal to 0 otherwise, and

$\mathcal{E}(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x)$ is equal to 1 if (P,Q) generates a good set of woods for (H,σ,R,x), and equal to 0 otherwise.

We note that it follows directly from the definition of $\Omega(H,\sigma,R,x)$ that $\mathcal{L}(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x)$, $\mathcal{H}(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x)$, and $\mathcal{E}(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x)$ are all equal to 0 unless every member of Q is $(\mathcal{M}(P)\cup H)$-connected, (which implies that every member of P is $(\mathcal{M}(P)\cup H)$-connected), and we now assume that every member of Q is $(\mathcal{M}(P)\cup H)$-connected.

To construct $\mathcal{L}(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x)$, we first note that $\prod_{F\in\mathbb{K}(P,Q)}\left(1-\tilde{\mathbb{M}}(P,F,H,A,\sigma,R,x)\right)$ is 1 if $\mathbb{M}(P,F,H,A,\sigma,R,x)$ is *false* for *all* $F\in\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$, and 0 otherwise, or in other words, it is 0 if there *exists* an $F\in\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$ such that $\mathbb{M}(P,F,H,A,\sigma,R,x)$ is true, and 1 otherwise.

Hence

$$\mathcal{L}(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x)=\prod_{A\in(Q\vdash P)}\left(1-\prod_{F\in\mathbb{K}(P,Q)}\left(1-\tilde{\mathbb{M}}(P,F,H,A,\sigma,R,x)\right)\right).$$

For every ordered pair (Q,H) of a wood Q and a partition H such that every member of Q is $(\mathcal{M}(Q)\cup H)$-connected, we define $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(Q,H)$ to be the set whose members are all the members G of $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M}(Q),H)$ such that $Q\subset G$ holds. Then $\mathcal{H}(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x)$ may be constructed as:

$$\mathcal{H}(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x)=\mathcal{L}(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x)\prod_{G\in\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(Q,H)}\left(1-\mathcal{L}(P,G,H,\sigma,R,x)\right)$$

For every ordered triple (P,Q,H) of a wood P, a wood Q such that $\mathcal{M}(Q)=\mathcal{M}(P)$ holds and $P\subseteq Q$ holds, and a partition H such that every member of Q is $(\mathcal{M}(P)\cup H)$-connected, we define $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(P,Q,H)$ to be the set whose members are all the members (F,G) of $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}(P),H)$ such that $F\subseteq P\subseteq Q\subseteq G$ holds and $(F,G)\neq(P,Q)$. Then condition (ii) of Lemma 9 may be expressed by the function $\prod_{(F,G)\in\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(P,Q,H)}\left(1-\mathcal{L}(F,G,H,\sigma,R,x)\right)$, which is 0 unless *no* member (F,G) of $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(P,Q,H)$ is a member of $\Omega(H,\sigma,R,x)$.

Hence $\mathcal{E}(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x)$ may be constructed as:

$$\mathcal{E}(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x)=\mathcal{L}(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x)\prod_{(F,G)\in\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(P,Q,H)}\left(1-\mathcal{L}(F,G,H,\sigma,R,x)\right).$$

We observe that the following inequalities hold:

$$\mathcal{E}\left(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x\right)\leq\mathcal{H}\left(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x\right)\leq\mathcal{L}\left(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x\right).$$

For every ordered pair (A,B) of sets A and B, we define $\mathcal{S}\left(A,B\right)$ to be 1 if $A\subseteq B$ holds, and 0 otherwise.

Then if V is any partition such that $\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)$ is finite and $\#\left(V\right)\geq 2$ holds, H is any partition such that if E is any member of H such that E intersects *more* than one member of V, then E has *exactly* two members, σ is any real number such that $0<\sigma\leq\frac{3}{25}$ holds, R is any finite real number >0, and d is any integer ≥ 1, it follows directly from the discussion on pages 51 to 54 that the following identity holds for all ordered pairs (F,x) of a member F of $\mathcal{G}\left(V,H\right)$ and a member x of $\mathbb{F}_d\left(V\right)$:

$$\sum_{(P,Q)\in\mathcal{N}(V,H)}\mathcal{E}\left(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x\right)\mathcal{S}\left(P,F\right)\mathcal{S}\left(F,Q\right)=1.$$

In fact, for any given ordered pair (F,x) of a member F of $\mathcal{G}\left(V,H\right)$ and a member x of $\mathbb{F}_d\left(V\right)$, exactly one term in the left-hand side of this equation is equal to 1, and all the remaining terms are equal to 0, and the term that is equal to 1 is the term corresponding to the unique member (P,Q) of $\Delta\left(H,\sigma,R,x\right)$ such that $F\in\mathbb{K}\left(P,Q\right)$ holds.

We now make the following observations:

(1) If F is any wood, B is any set, and G is any subset of F such that $\mathcal{P}\left(F,B\right)\subseteq G$ holds, then $\mathcal{P}\left(G,B\right)=\mathcal{P}\left(F,B\right)$ holds. For if C is any member of $\mathcal{P}\left(F,B\right)$, then C is a member of G such that $C\subset B$ holds and there is no member D of F such that $C\subset D\subset B$ holds, hence there is no member D of G such that $C\subset D\subset B$ holds, hence C is a member of $\mathcal{P}\left(G,B\right)$. Now let C be any member of $\mathcal{P}\left(G,B\right)$. Then C is a member of G, hence a member of F, such that $C\subset B$ holds, hence as shown on page 23 the fact that F is a wood implies that there is a unique member E of $\mathcal{P}\left(F,B\right)$ such that $C\subseteq E$ holds. Let E be the unique member of $\mathcal{P}\left(F,B\right)$ such that $C\subseteq E$ holds. Then E is a member of G, (since by assumption $\mathcal{P}\left(F,B\right)$ is a subset of G), hence $C\subset E$ cannot hold, (for if $C\subset E$ held then E would be a member of G such that $C\subset E\subset B$ held, contradicting the fact that C is a member of $\mathcal{P}\left(G,B\right)$), hence $C=E$ holds, hence C is a member of $\mathcal{P}\left(F,B\right)$.

(2) If P is any wood, B is any nonempty subset of $\mathcal{U}(P)$, and G is any subset of P such that G is a wood, $\mathcal{U}(G)$ is a member of $\bar{P}$, and $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P},B\right)$ is a member of $\bar{G}$, then $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{G},B\right)=\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P},B\right)$ holds. For $\bar{G}$ has at least one member, namely $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P},B\right)$, that contains B as a subset, hence by definition $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{G},B\right)$ is the *smallest* member of $\bar{G}$ that contains B as a subset. Now the assumptions that G is a subset of P and that $\mathcal{U}(G)$ is a member of $\bar{P}$ imply that $\bar{G}$ is a subset of $\bar{P}$. Hence there is no member C of $\bar{G}$ such that $B\subseteq C\subset\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P},B\right)$ holds, for if C was such a member of $\bar{G}$ then C would be a member of $\bar{P}$ such that $B\subseteq C\subset\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P},B\right)$ held, which contradicts the fact that $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P},B\right)$ is the *smallest* member of $\bar{P}$ that contains B as a subset. Hence $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P},B\right)$ is the *smallest* member of $\bar{G}$ that contains B as a subset.

(3) If F is any wood, H is any set such that every member of H is a set, i is any member of $\mathcal{O}(F,H)$, and G is any subset of F such that G is a wood and $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$ is a member of G, then i is a member of $\mathcal{O}(G,H)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)=\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$ holds. For by definition $\mathcal{O}(F,H)$ is the set whose members are all the members i of $\mathcal{U}(F)$ such that there *exists* a member A of F such that $i\in A$ holds and there is *no* member B of H such that $i\in B$ and $B\subseteq A$ both hold, and $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$ is the *largest* member A of F such that $i\in A$ holds and there is *no* member B of H such that $i\in B$ and $B\subseteq A$ both hold. And by assumption $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$ is a member of G, hence G has at least one member, namely $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$, that has i as a member and does *not* contain as a subset any member of H that has i as a member, hence i is a member of $\mathcal{U}(G)$ and also a member of $\mathcal{O}(G,H)$, hence $\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)$ is defined and moreover $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)\subseteq\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)$ holds. And furthermore there is *no* member A of G such that $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)\subset A$ holds and A does *not* contain as a subset any member of H that has i as a member, for if A *was* such a member of G then A would be a member of F such that $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)\subset A$ held and A does *not* contain as a subset any member of H that has i as a member, and by the definition of $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$ there is *no* such member A of F. Hence $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$ is the *largest* member of G that has i as a member and does *not* contain as a subset any member of H that has i as a member, hence $\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)=\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$ holds.

(4) Let P be any wood, let F be any wood such that $\mathcal{M}(F)=\mathcal{M}(P)$ holds and $P\subseteq F$ holds, and let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$. Then $F\cap\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P,A))$ is a wood of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$. We note first that, as shown on pages 23 and 24, $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$ is a partition of A such that $\#(\mathcal{P}(P,A))\geq 2$ holds, hence $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{P}(P,A))$ is equal to A hence is a finite set. Now certainly no member of $F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$ is empty and no two members of $F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$ overlap, and moreover P is a subset of F hence every member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ is a member of $F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$, hence $F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$ is a subset of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$ that has $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ as a subset, hence $\mathcal{M}(F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A)))$ is equal to $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$. And furthermore, every member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$ is a subset of A, hence every member of $F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$ is a subset of A, hence $\mathcal{U}(F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A)))$ is a subset of A, hence every member of $\mathcal{U}(F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A)))$ is a member of some member of $\mathcal{M}(F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))) = \mathcal{P}(P, A)$.

(5) Let P be any wood, let Q be any wood such that $\mathcal{M}(Q) = \mathcal{M}(P)$ holds and $P \subseteq Q$ holds, and let B be any member of $(Q \vdash P)$. Then there exists a *unique* member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$ such that $B \in \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$ holds, and the unique member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$ with this property is given by $A = \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$. For B is a subset of $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$, B overlaps no member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)\right)$, and B is *not* a strict subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)\right)$, (for if B was a strict subset of a member E of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)\right)$ then E would be a member of $\bar{P}$ such that $B \subseteq E \subset \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$ held, which contradicts the fact that $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$ is the *smallest* member of $\bar{P}$ to contain B as a subset), hence B is a member of $\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)\right)\right)$. Now let A be any member of $\bar{P}$ such that B is a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$. Then $B \subseteq A$ holds, and each member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ is either a subset of B or else does not intersect B, and furthermore since B is a member of $(Q \vdash P)$ hence is *not* a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, each member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ is either a *strict* subset of B or else does not intersect B. Furthermore B is *nonempty.* Let i be any member of B. Then i is a member of A, and $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$, which by definition is the unique member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ that has i as a member, is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ such that $B \cap \mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$ is nonempty, hence, as just shown, $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$ is a *strict* subset of B, hence the fact that $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$ is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ implies that there is *no* member C of $\bar{P}$ such that $B \subseteq C \subset A$ holds, (for any such member C of $\bar{P}$ would be a member of P such that $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i) \subset C \subset A$ held), hence A is equal to $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, B\right)$.

Lemma 12. Let P be any wood, let F be any wood such that $\mathcal{M}(F) = \mathcal{M}(P)$ holds and $P \subseteq F$ holds, let H be any partition, let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$, let B be any member of $(\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(P, A))$, let σ be any real number such that $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{1}{8}$ holds, let R be any real number > 0, and let x be any member of $\mathbb{F}_d(\mathcal{M}(P))$, where d is an integer ≥ 1.

Let $Z \equiv \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$.

Then the proposition $\mathbb{M}(P, F, H, B, \sigma, R, x)$ is equivalent to the proposition $\mathbb{M}(P \cap Z, F \cap Z, H, B, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, Z))$.

Proof. We first note that by observation (4) on page 64, both $P \cap Z$ and $F \cap Z$ are woods of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, and B is a member of $(\Xi(\mathcal{M}(P \cap Z)) \vdash \mathcal{M}(P \cap Z))$, and we note furthermore that it follows directly from the definition of $\mathbb{F}_d(\mathcal{M}(P))$ that $\downarrow(x, Z) = \downarrow(x, \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A)))$ is a member of $\mathbb{F}_d(\mathcal{P}(P, A)) = \mathbb{F}_d(\mathcal{M}(P \cap Z))$, as is required for the proposition $\mathbb{M}(P \cap Z, F \cap Z, H, B, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, Z))$ to be defined.

We next note that $\mathcal{P}(F, B)$ is a subset of $Z = \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$, for by assumption B is a member of $(\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(P, A))$, hence if C is any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ then either $C \cap B$ is empty or else C is a *strict* subset of B. Let D be any member of $\mathcal{P}(F, B)$ and let C be any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ such that $C \cap D$ is nonempty. Then C is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ such that $C \cap B$ is nonempty, hence $C \subset B$ holds, hence $D \subset C$ cannot hold, (for if $D \subset C$ held then C would be a member of P, hence a member of F, such that $D \subset C \subset B$ held, contradicting the fact that D is a member of $\mathcal{P}(F, B)$), hence since C does not overlap D, $C \subseteq D$ holds. Hence if D is any member of $\mathcal{P}(F, B)$ then D is a nonempty subset of B, hence a nonempty subset of A, such that each member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ is either a subset of D or else does not intersect D, hence D is a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$, hence $\mathcal{P}(F, B)$ is a subset of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$

Hence $\mathcal{P}(F, B)$ is a subset of $F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A)) = F \cap Z$, hence by observation 1) on page 63, $\mathcal{P}(F \cap Z, B) = \mathcal{P}(F, B)$ holds, and it immediately follows from this, by the definition of $\mathbb{L}(F, B, x)$, that $\mathbb{L}(F \cap Z, B, \downarrow(x, Z)) = \mathbb{L}(F, B, x)$ holds.

And it immediately follows from this, in particular, that $\mathbb{L}(F \cap Z, B, \downarrow(x, Z)) < R$ holds ifif $\mathbb{L}(F, B, x) < R$ holds.

We next note that $\mathcal{Y}(\bar{P}, B)$ is equal to A, for B is a *nonempty* subset of A such that each member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ is either a *strict* subset of B or else does not intersect B, hence there can be no member C of $\bar{P}$ such that $B \subseteq C \subset A$ holds, (for if C was such a member of $\bar{P}$ then C would be a member of P, and if i was any member of B, then $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i) \subset C \subset A$ would hold, contradicting the fact that $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$ is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$), hence A is the *smallest* member of $\bar{P}$ to contain B as a subset.

Now $\mathcal{U}(P \cap Z) = \mathcal{U}(P \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A)))$ is equal to A, hence $A = \mathcal{Y}(\bar{P}, B)$ is certainly a member of $\overline{(P \cap Z)}$, hence by observation (2) on page 63, $\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \cap Z)}, B\right) = \mathcal{Y}(\bar{P}, B) = A$ holds.

Now H is a *partition,* hence as shown on pages 33 and 34, if i is any member of B and j is any member of $(A \vdash B)$ such that $\{i, j\}$ is a member of H, then both i and j are members of $\mathcal{O}(F, H)$, and furthermore $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ is the largest member of F that has i as a member but does *not* have j as a member, and $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, j)$ is the largest member of F that has j as a member but does *not* have i as a member.

Now let i be any member of B and j be any member of $(A \vdash B)$ such that $\{i, j\}$ is a member of H. Then $\{i, j\}$ is a subset of A hence $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i) \subset A$ holds and $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, j) \subset A$ holds. And $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$ is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ that intersects B hence is a strict subset of B, hence j is not a member of $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$, hence since $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$ is a member of F, $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ holds, hence $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ cannot be a strict subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, (for if $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ was a strict subset of a member C of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, then C would be a member of P such that $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i) \subset C \subset A$ held, which contradicts the fact that $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$ is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$), hence since $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ overlaps no member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ is a member of $Z = \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$, hence $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ is a member of $F \cap Z$, hence by observation (3) on page 64, i is a member of $\mathcal{O}(F \cap Z, H)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(F \cap Z, H, i) = \mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ holds. And j is *not* a member of B, hence $\mathcal{K}(P, A, j)$ is *not* a subset of B, hence $\mathcal{K}(P, A, j)$ does *not* intersect B, hence i is *not* a member of $\mathcal{K}(P, A, j)$, hence $\mathcal{K}(P, A, j) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(F, H, j)$ holds, hence $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, j)$ cannot be a strict subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, hence $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, j)$ is a member of $Z = \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$, hence $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, j)$ is a member of $F \cap Z$, hence by observation (3) on page 64, j is a member of $\mathcal{O}(F \cap Z, H)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(F \cap Z, H, j) = \mathcal{Z}(F, H, j)$ holds.

Hence $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F \cap Z, H, i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F \cap Z, H, j)}\right| = \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F, H, j)}\right|$ holds, hence
$\mathbb{L}(F \cap Z, B, \downarrow(x, Z)) < \sigma \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F \cap Z, H, i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F \cap Z, H, j)}\right|$ holds ifif
$\mathbb{L}(F, B, x) < \sigma \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F, H, j)}\right|$ holds.

Lemma 13. Let P be any wood, let Q be any wood such that $\mathcal{M}(Q) = \mathcal{M}(P)$ holds and $P \subseteq Q$ holds, let H be any partition such that every member of Q is $(\mathcal{M}(P) \cup H)$-connected and such that if E is any member of H such that E intersects *more* than one member of $\mathcal{M}(P)$, then E has *exactly* two members, let σ be any real number such that $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{3}{25}$ holds, let R be any finite real number > 0, let d be any integer ≥ 1, and let x be any member of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$.

For each member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$ we define $Z_A \equiv \Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$.

Then

$$\mathcal{L}(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x) = \prod_{A \in \mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)} \mathcal{L}(P \cap Z_A, Q \cap Z_A, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, Z_A))$$

holds and

$$\mathcal{H}\left(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x\right) = \prod_{A \in \mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)} \mathcal{H}\left(P \cap Z_A, Q \cap Z_A, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow\left(x, Z_A\right)\right)$$

holds.

Proof. We first note that, by definition, $\mathcal{L}\left(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x\right)$ is equal to 1 if for every member B of $\left(Q \vdash P\right)$, there exists a member F of $\mathbb{K}\left(P, Q\right)$ such that $\mathbb{M}\left(P, F, H, B, \sigma, R, x\right)$ holds, and equal to 0 otherwise, hence by observation (5) on page 65, $\mathcal{L}\left(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x\right)$ is equal to 1 if for every member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$, and for every member B of $\left(Q \vdash P\right) \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right) = \left(Q \vdash P\right) \cap Z_A$, there exists a member F of $\mathbb{K}\left(P, Q\right)$ such that $\mathbb{M}\left(P, F, H, B, \sigma, R, x\right)$ holds, and equal to 0 otherwise, hence by Lemma 12, $\mathcal{L}\left(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x\right)$ is equal to 1 if for every member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$, and for every member B of $\left(Q \vdash P\right) \cap Z_A$, there exists a member F of $\mathbb{K}\left(P, Q\right)$ such that $\mathbb{M}\left(P \cap Z_A, F \cap Z_A, H, B, \sigma, R, \downarrow\left(x, Z_A\right)\right)$ holds, and equal to 0 otherwise.

Now let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$.

Then by observation (4) on page 64, both $P \cap Z_A$ and $Q \cap Z_A$ are woods of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$, and furthermore, every member of $Q \cap Z_A$ is $\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right) \cup H\right)$-connected, for if C is any member of $Q \cap Z_A$, then C is a member of Q hence is $\left(\mathcal{M}\left(P\right) \cup H\right)$-connected, hence if $\left\{J, K\right\}$ is any partition of C into two nonempty parts then there exists a member D of $\left(\mathcal{M}\left(P\right) \cup H\right)$ such that D intersects both J and K, and if D is a member of H then D is a member of $\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right) \cup H\right)$, while if D is a member of $\mathcal{M}\left(P\right)$ then D is a member of P such that $D \subset A$ holds, hence as shown on page 23 there is a unique member E of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$ such that $D \subseteq E$ holds, and this member E of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$ is a member of $\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right) \cup H\right)$ such that E intersects both J and K.

Hence, by definition, $\mathcal{L}\left(P \cap Z_A, Q \cap Z_A, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow\left(x, Z_A\right)\right)$ is equal to 1 if for every member B of $\left(Q \cap Z_A\right) \vdash \left(P \cap Z_A\right) = \left(Q \vdash P\right) \cap Z_A$, there exists a member G of $\mathbb{K}\left(P \cap Z_A, Q \cap Z_A\right)$ such that $\mathbb{M}\left(P \cap Z_A, G, H, B, \sigma, R, \downarrow\left(x, Z_A\right)\right)$ holds, and equal to 0 otherwise.

Suppose now that B is a member of $\left(Q \vdash P\right) \cap Z_A$ such that there exists a member G of $\mathbb{K}\left(P \cap Z_A, Q \cap Z_A\right)$ such that $\mathbb{M}\left(P \cap Z_A, G, H, B, \sigma, R, \downarrow\left(x, Z_A\right)\right)$ holds, and let G be such a member of $\mathbb{K}\left(P \cap Z_A, Q \cap Z_A\right)$. Then $F \equiv P \cup G$ is a member of $\mathbb{K}\left(P, Q\right)$ such that $F \cap Z_A = \left(P \cup G\right) \cap Z_A = \left(P \cap Z_A\right) \cup \left(G \cap Z_A\right) = \left(P \cap Z_A\right) \cup G = G$ holds, hence $\mathbb{M}\left(P \cap Z_A, F \cap Z_A, H, B, \sigma, R, \downarrow\left(x, Z_A\right)\right)$ holds.

Now suppose that B is a member of $(Q \vdash P) \cap Z_A$ such that there exists a member F of $\mathbb{K}(P, Q)$ such that $\mathbb{M}(P \cap Z_A, Q \cap Z_A, H, B, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, Z_A))$ holds. Then $G \equiv F \cap Z_A$ is a member of $\mathbb{K}(P \cap Z_A, Q \cap Z_A)$ such that $\mathbb{M}(P \cap Z_A, G, H, B, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, Z_A))$ holds.

Hence $\mathcal{L}(P \cap Z_A, Q \cap Z_A, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, Z_A))$ is equal to 1 if for every member B of $(Q \vdash P) \cap Z_A$, there exists a member F of $\mathbb{K}(P, Q)$ such that $\mathbb{M}(P \cap Z_A, F \cap Z_A, H, B, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, Z_A))$ holds, and equal to 0 otherwise.

And this is true for every member A of $\mathbb{B}(\bar{P})$, hence

$$\mathcal{L}(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x) = \prod_{A \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{P})} \mathcal{L}(P \cap Z_A, Q \cap Z_A, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, Z_A))$$

holds.

Now $\mathcal{H}(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x)$ is equal to

$$\mathcal{L}(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x) \prod_{F \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(Q,H)} (1 - \mathcal{L}(P, F, H, \sigma, R, x)),$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(Q, H)$ was defined on page 62 to be the set whose members are all the members F of $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M}(Q), H)$ such that $Q \subset F$ holds.

Suppose $\mathcal{H}(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x)$ is equal to 1. Then $\mathcal{L}(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x)$ is equal to 1, hence by the result just obtained, $\mathcal{L}(P \cap Z_A, Q \cap Z_A, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, Z_A))$ is equal to 1 for every member A of $\mathbb{B}(\bar{P})$, and for every member F of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(Q, H)$, $\mathcal{L}(P, F, H, \sigma, R, x)$ is equal to 0, hence in particular, for every member B of $\mathbb{B}(\bar{P})$, and for every member G of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(Q \cap Z_B, H)$, $\mathcal{L}(P, Q \cup G, H, \sigma, R, x)$ is equal to 0 Now if B is any member of $\mathbb{B}(\bar{P})$, G is any member of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(Q \cap Z_B, H)$, and A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(\bar{P})$, then $(Q \cup G) \cap Z_A$ is equal to G if A is equal to B, and equal to $Q \cap Z_A$ if A is *not* equal to B, hence by the result just obtained, $\mathcal{L}(P, Q \cup G, H, \sigma, R, x)$ is equal to

$$\mathcal{L}(P \cap Z_B, G, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, Z_B)) \prod_{A \in \left(\mathbb{B}(\bar{P}) \vdash \{B\}\right)} \mathcal{L}(P \cap Z_A, Q \cap Z_A, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, Z_A)),$$

hence since the fact that $\mathcal{L}(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x)$ is equal to 1 implies, as just shown, that $\mathcal{L}(P \cap Z_A, Q \cap Z_A, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, Z_A))$ is equal to 1 for every member A of $\mathbb{B}(\bar{P})$, the fact that $\mathcal{L}(P, Q \cup G, H, \sigma, R, x)$ is equal to 0 implies that $\mathcal{L}(P \cap Z_B, G, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, Z_B))$ is equal to 0. And this is true for *every* member G of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(Q \cap Z_B, H)$, hence since, as just shown, the fact that $\mathcal{L}(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x)$ is equal to 1 implies that $\mathcal{L}(P \cap Z_B, Q \cap Z_B, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, Z_B))$ is equal to 1, it follows that

$$\mathcal{H}(P \cap Z_B, Q \cap Z_B, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, Z_B)) =$$

$$= \mathcal{L}(P \cap Z_B, Q \cap Z_B, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow (x, Z_B)) \prod_{G \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(Q \cap Z_B, H)} (1 - \mathcal{L}(P \cap Z_B, G, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow (x, Z_B)))$$

is equal to 1. And this is true for *every* member B of $\mathbb{B}(\bar{P})$, hence the assumption that $\mathcal{H}(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x)$ is equal to 1 implies that $\prod_{B \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{P})} \mathcal{H}(P \cap Z_B, Q \cap Z_B, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow (x, Z_B))$ is equal to 1.

Now assume that $\prod_{B \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{P})} \mathcal{H}(P \cap Z_B, Q \cap Z_B, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow (x, Z_B))$ is equal to 1, hence that $\mathcal{L}(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x) = \prod_{B \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{P})} \mathcal{L}(P \cap Z_B, Q \cap Z_B, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow (x, Z_B))$ is equal to 1, and that for every member B of $\mathbb{B}(\bar{P})$, and for every member G of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(Q \cap Z_B, H)$, $\mathcal{L}(P \cap Z_B, G, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow (x, Z_B))$ is equal to 0. Let F be any member of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(Q, H)$. Then by the first part of this Lemma, $\mathcal{L}(P, F, H, \sigma, R, x)$ is equal to $\prod_{B \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{P})} \mathcal{L}(P \cap Z_B, F \cap Z_B, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow (x, Z_B))$, and by the fact that F is a member of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(Q, H)$, or in other words, that F is a member of $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M}(Q), H)$ such that $Q \subset F$ holds, there exists at least one member B of $\mathbb{B}(\bar{P})$ such that $Q \cap Z_B \subset F \cap Z_B$ holds, hence such that $F \cap Z_B$ is a member of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(Q \cap Z_B, H)$, hence such that $\mathcal{L}(P \cap Z_B, F \cap Z_B, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow (x, Z_B))$ is equal to 0. Hence $\mathcal{L}(P, F, H, \sigma, R, x)$ is equal to 0. And this is true for *every* member F of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(Q, H)$, hence $\mathcal{H}(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x)$ is equal to 1.

Hence $\mathcal{H}(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x)$ is equal to 1 if and only if $\prod_{A \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{P})} \mathcal{H}(P \cap Z_A, Q \cap Z_A, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow (x, Z_A))$ is equal to 1, hence, since each of these expressions can take *only* the values 0 and 1, they are equal.

Lemma 14. Let V be any partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, and let H be any partition such that if E is any member of H such that E intersects *more* than one member of V, then E has *exactly* two members.

Let σ be any real number such that $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{1}{8}$ holds, and let λ be the real number defined by $\lambda \equiv \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - 8\sigma}\right)$, so that $0 < \lambda \leq \frac{1}{4}$ holds.

We note that λ and σ satisfy the equation $\lambda = \frac{\sigma}{1 - 2\lambda}$, and that $0 < \sigma < \lambda$ holds.

Let R be any finite real number > 0, let d be any integer ≥ 1, let x be any member of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$, and let (P, Q) be any member of $\Omega(H, \sigma, R, x)$.

Let i and j be any two members of $\mathcal{U}(V)$ such that $\{i, j\}$ is a member of H and is *not* a subset of any member of V, let J be the set whose members are all the $A \in Q$ such that $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i) \subseteq A \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, i)$ holds, and let K be the set whose members are all the $B \in Q$ such that $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, j) \subseteq B \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, j)$ holds.

Let u be any member of $\mathbb{R}^J$ such that $u_A \geq 0$ holds for all $A \in J$, and such that $\sum_{A \in J} u_A = 1$ holds, and let v be any member of $\mathbb{R}^K$ such that $v_B \geq 0$ holds for all

$B \in K$, and such that $\sum_{B\in K} v_B = 1$ holds.

Then

$$\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}\right| \leq \left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right)\left|\left(\sum_{A\in J} u_A x_A\right) - \left(\sum_{B\in K} v_B x_B\right)\right|$$

holds and

$$\left|\left(\sum_{A\in J} u_A x_A\right) - \left(\sum_{B\in K} v_B x_B\right)\right| \leq \left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right)\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}\right|$$

holds.

Proof. We first obtain the stated lower bound on $\left|\left(\sum_{A\in J} u_A x_A\right) - \left(\sum_{B\in K} v_B x_B\right)\right|$. In fact we will prove, defining $T \equiv \max\limits_{F\in\mathbb{K}(P,Q)} \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|$, that $T \leq \left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right)\left|\left(\sum_{A\in J} u_A x_A\right) - \left(\sum_{B\in K} v_B x_B\right)\right|$ holds.

For, using the triangle inequality, we have, for arbitrary $F \in \mathbb{K}(P,Q)$, that

$$\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right| \leq \left\{\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - \left(\sum_{A\in J} u_A x_A\right)\right| + \right.$$

$$\left. + \left|\left(\sum_{A\in J} u_A x_A\right) - \left(\sum_{B\in K} v_B x_B\right)\right| + \left|\left(\sum_{B\in K} v_B x_B\right) - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right|\right\}$$

holds.

Now we note that J is the set of all the possible $\mathcal{Z}(G,H,i)$ for $G \in \mathbb{K}(P,Q)$. Hence, from Lemma 6 (d), we have that

$$\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - \left(\sum_{A\in J} u_A x_A\right)\right| \leq \sum_{A\in J} u_A \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_A\right| \leq \sum_{A\in J} u_A \lambda T = \lambda T$$

holds, (where we used that $\sum_{A\in J} u_A = 1$, and that all u_A are ≥ 0), and similarly we have that $\left|\left(\sum_{B\in K} v_B x_B\right) - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right| \leq \lambda T$ holds.

Hence

$$\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}\right| \leq 2\lambda T + \left|\left(\sum_{A\in J} u_A x_A\right) - \left(\sum_{B\in K} v_B x_B\right)\right|$$

holds. And this is true for all $F \in \mathbb{K}(P,Q)$, hence
$T \leq 2\lambda T + \left|\left(\sum_{A\in J} u_A x_A\right) - \left(\sum_{B\in K} v_B x_B\right)\right|$ holds, hence
$T \leq \left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right)\left|\left(\sum_{A\in J} u_A x_A\right) - \left(\sum_{B\in K} v_B x_B\right)\right|$ holds.

But $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}\right| \leq T$ holds, hence

$$\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}\right| \leq \left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right)\left|\left(\sum_{A\in J} u_A x_A\right) - \left(\sum_{B\in K} v_B x_B\right)\right|$$

holds.

We now obtain the stated upper bound on $\left|\left(\sum_{A\in J} u_A x_A\right) - \left(\sum_{B\in K} v_B x_B\right)\right|$. In fact

$$\left|\left(\sum_{A\in J} u_A x_A\right) - \left(\sum_{B\in K} v_B x_B\right)\right| = \left|\sum_{\substack{A\in J\\ B\in K}} u_A v_B\left(x_A - x_B\right)\right| \leq \sum_{\substack{A\in J\\ B\in K}} u_A v_B\left|x_A - x_B\right|$$

$$\leq \sum_{\substack{A\in J\\ B\in K}} u_A v_B \max_{\substack{C\in J\\ D\in K}}\left|x_C - x_D\right| \leq T.$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 6 (e), $T \leq \left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right)\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}\right|$ holds, hence $\left|\left(\sum_{A\in J} u_A x_A\right) - \left(\sum_{B\in K} v_B x_B\right)\right| \leq \left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda}\right)\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}\right|$ holds.

Lemma 15. Let H be a set such that every member of H is a set, let n be an integer ≥ 1, let V be a partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite, $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is $(V\cup H)$-connected, and $\#(V) = n$, and let A and B be any members of V. Then there exists an integer m such that $1 \leq m \leq n$ holds, and a map M such that $\mathcal{D}(M)$ is the set of all the integers p such that $1 \leq p \leq m$ holds, $\mathcal{R}(M) \subseteq V$ holds, $M_1 = A$ holds, $M_m = B$ holds, and such that if p is any integer such that $1 \leq p$ and $p \leq (m-1)$ both hold, then there exists a member C of H such that $C\cap M_p \neq \emptyset$ and $C \cap M_{p+1} \neq \emptyset$ both hold.

Proof. We use induction on n. The result is obvious for $n = 1$. Now let $n \geq 2$ hold and let V be a partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite, $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is $(V\cup H)$-connected, and $\#(V) = n$, and let A and B be any members of V. Then if $A = B$ the result is obvious. Assume now that $A \neq B$. We consider the partition of $\mathcal{U}(V)$ into the nonempty parts B and $(\mathcal{U}(V) \vdash B)$. Then the fact that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is $(V\cup H)$-connected implies that there exists a member C of $(V\cup H)$ such that $C\cap B \neq \emptyset$ holds and $C\cap(\mathcal{U}(V)\vdash B) \neq \emptyset$ holds. But V is a partition hence $C\cap B$ and $C\cap(\mathcal{U}(V)\vdash B)$ cannot both be nonempty for any member C of V, hence C must be a member of H. Let C be a member of H such that $C\cap B\neq\emptyset$ holds and $C\cap(\mathcal{U}(V)\vdash B)\neq\emptyset$ holds. Then $C\cap(\mathcal{U}(V)\vdash B)\neq\emptyset$ implies that there exists a member D of the partition V such that $D\neq B$ holds and

$C \cap D \neq \emptyset$ holds. Let D be a member of the partition V such that $D \neq B$ holds and $C \cap D \neq \emptyset$ holds. Then $(V \vdash \{B\})$ is a partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V \vdash \{B\})$ is finite, $\mathcal{U}(V \vdash \{B\})$ is $((V \vdash \{B\}) \cup H)$-connected, and $\#(V \vdash \{B\}) = (n-1) \geq 1$ holds, and A and D are members of $(V \vdash \{B\})$, hence by the induction assumption there exists an integer p such that $1 \leq p \leq (n-1)$ holds, and a map P such that $\mathcal{D}(P)$ is the set of all the integers q such that $1 \leq q \leq p$ holds, $\mathcal{R}(P) \subseteq (V \vdash \{B\})$ holds, $P_1 = A$ holds, $P_p = D$ holds, and such that if q is any integer such that $1 \leq q$ and $q \leq (p-1)$ both hold, then there exists a member E of H such that $E \cap P_q \neq \emptyset$ holds and $E \cap P_{q+1} \neq \emptyset$ holds. Let p be such an integer and P be such a map. Then $M \equiv P \cup \{(p+1, B)\}$ is a map with all the required properties.

Corollary. Let H be a set such that every member of H is a set, let n be an integer ≥ 1, let V be a partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite, $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is $(V \cup H)$-connected, and $\#(V) = n$ holds, let A and B be any members of V, let T be any real number such that $T > 0$ holds, let d be any integer ≥ 1, and let x be any member of $\mathbb{E}_{dV}$ such that if C and D are any members of V such that there exists a member E of H such that $C \cap E \neq \emptyset$ holds and $D \cap E \neq \emptyset$ holds, then $|x_C - x_D| \leq T$ holds. Then $|x_A - x_B| \leq (n-1)T$ holds.

Proof. By Lemma 15 there exists an integer m such that $1 \leq m \leq n$ holds, and a map M such that $\mathcal{D}(M)$ is the set of all the integers p such that $1 \leq p \leq m$ holds, $\mathcal{R}(M) \subseteq V$ holds, $M_1 = A$ holds, $M_m = B$ holds, and such that if p is any integer such that $1 \leq p$ and $p \leq (m-1)$ both hold, then there exists a member E of H such that $E \cap M_p \neq \emptyset$ holds and $E \cap M_{p+1} \neq \emptyset$ holds. Let m be such an integer and M be such a map. Then by the triangle inequality, $|x_A - x_B| \leq \sum_{p \in \mathcal{D}(M)} \left| x_{M_p} - x_{M_{p+1}} \right| \leq (m-1)T$ holds.

5 The BPHZ Integrands.

For any ordered pair (M, θ) of a map M such that $\mathcal{D}(M)$ is finite, and every member of $\mathcal{R}(M)$ is a finite set, and a map θ such that $\mathcal{D}(M) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\theta)$ holds, and $\mathcal{R}(\theta)$ is a subset of the set $\mathbb{Z}$ of all the integers, we define $\mathbb{X}(M, \theta)$ to be the set whose members are all the maps p such that $\mathcal{D}(p) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M))$ holds, $\mathcal{R}(p) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ holds, and for every member A of $\mathcal{D}(M)$, $\sum_{\alpha \in M_A} p_\alpha \leq \theta_A$ holds.

We note that this definition has the immediate consequence that if, for any member A of $\mathcal{D}(M)$, $\theta_A < 0$ holds, then $\mathbb{X}(M, \theta)$ is the empty set, since there is no map p with the required properties.

Lemma 16. Let M be a map such that $\mathcal{D}(M)$ is finite, and every member of $\mathcal{R}(M)$ is a finite set, and let D be a map such that $\mathcal{D}(M) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(D)$ holds, and $\mathcal{R}(D)$ is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}$. Let λ be a map whose domain is $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M))$, such that for each member α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M))$, λ_α is a nonempty finite set, and such that for any two distinct members α and β of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M))$, $\lambda_\alpha \cap \lambda_\beta = \emptyset$.

And let T be the map such that $\mathcal{D}(T) = \mathcal{D}(M)$, and for each member A of $\mathcal{D}(T) = \mathcal{D}(M)$, $T_A \equiv \bigcup_{\alpha \in M_A} \lambda_\alpha$. (Thus $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(T))$ is the disjoint union of all the λ_α, $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M))$.)

Let Y be a map such that $\mathcal{D}(Y) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(T)) = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M))} \lambda_\alpha$, and such that for each member β of $\mathcal{D}(Y)$, Y_β is an operator such that the Y_β obey the same commutative, associative and distributive laws of addition and multiplication as the real numbers.

Then the following identity holds:

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{X}(M,D)} \left(\prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M))} \left(\left(\frac{1}{n_\alpha!} \right) \left(\sum_{\beta \in \lambda_\alpha} Y_\beta \right)^{n_\alpha} \right) \right) = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{X}(T,D)} \left(\prod_{\beta \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(T))} \left(\frac{1}{s_\beta!} \right) Y_\beta^{s_\beta} \right)$$

Proof. For any ordered pair (X, p) of a finite set X and an integer $p \geq 0$, we define $F(X, p)$ to be the set whose members are all the maps q whose domain is X, whose range is a subset of $\mathbb{N}$, and which satisfy the requirement that $\sum_{\alpha \in X} q_\alpha = p$ holds. (We note that $F(X, p)$ is a finite set.)

Then by the multinomial theorem for $p \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\left(\frac{1}{p!} \right) \left(\sum_{\beta \in \lambda_\alpha} Y_\beta \right)^p = \sum_{q \in F(\lambda_\alpha, p)} \left(\prod_{\beta \in \lambda_\alpha} \left(\left(\frac{1}{q_\beta!} \right) Y_\beta^{q_\beta} \right) \right)$$

Hence for any map n such that $\mathcal{D}(n) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M))$ and $\mathcal{R}(n) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M))} \left(\left(\frac{1}{n_\alpha!} \right) \left(\sum_{\beta \in \lambda_\alpha} Y_\beta \right)^{n_\alpha} \right) = \prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M))} \left(\sum_{q \in F(\lambda_\alpha, n_\alpha)} \left(\prod_{\beta \in \lambda_\alpha} \left(\left(\frac{1}{q_\beta!} \right) Y_\beta^{q_\beta} \right) \right) \right)$$

$$= \prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M))} \left(\sum_{q_\alpha \in F(\lambda_\alpha, n_\alpha)} \left(\prod_{\beta \in \lambda_\alpha} \left(\left(\frac{1}{(q_\alpha)_\beta!} \right) Y_\beta^{(q_\alpha)_\beta} \right) \right) \right),$$

where in the second form of the right-hand side we rewrote the dummy variable q as q_α in the factor associated with the member α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M))$.

Now for any ordered pair (n,λ) of a map n such that $\mathcal{D}(n)$ is finite and $\mathcal{R}(n) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, and a map λ such that $\mathcal{D}(\lambda) = \mathcal{D}(n)$, and for each member α of $\mathcal{D}(\lambda) = \mathcal{D}(n)$, λ_α is a finite set, and such that for any two distinct members α and β of $\mathcal{D}(\lambda)$, $\lambda_\alpha \cap \lambda_\beta = \emptyset$, we define $G(\lambda,n)$ to be the set whose members are all the maps s whose domain is $\bigcup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{D}(\lambda)} \lambda_\alpha$, and whose range is a subset of $\mathbb{N}$, and such that for each member α of $\mathcal{D}(n) = \mathcal{D}(\lambda)$, $\sum_{\beta\in\lambda_\alpha} s_\beta = n_\alpha$ holds.

Now we observe that in the final form of the right-hand side of the above formula, in which the dummy variable q has been re-written as q_α in the factor associated with the member α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M))$, we have a sum over all maps q such that $\mathcal{D}(q) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M))$, and for each member α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M)) = \mathcal{D}(\lambda) = \mathcal{D}(n)$, q_α is a member of $F(\lambda_\alpha, n_\alpha)$. We define the following one-to-one correspondence between $G(\lambda,n)$ and the set of all maps q such that $\mathcal{D}(q) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M)) = \mathcal{D}(\lambda) = \mathcal{D}(n)$, and for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}(\lambda)$, $q_\alpha \in F(\lambda_\alpha, n_\alpha)$ holds:

Given any member s of $G(\lambda,n)$, the corresponding map q is the map whose domain is $\mathcal{D}(\lambda) = \mathcal{D}(n)$, and such that for each member α of $\mathcal{D}(\lambda)$, $q_\alpha = \downarrow(s, \lambda_\alpha)$, (or in other words, q_α is the restriction of the map s to the domain λ_α), which is a member of $F(\lambda_\alpha, n_\alpha)$ in consequence of the definition of $G(\lambda,n)$.

And given any map q such that $\mathcal{D}(q) = \mathcal{D}(\lambda)$, and for each member α of $\mathcal{D}(\lambda)$, $q_\alpha \in F(\lambda_\alpha, n_\alpha)$ holds, we define $s \equiv \bigcup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{D}(\lambda)} q_\alpha$, which is a member of $G(\lambda,n)$ in consequence of the definition of $F(\lambda_\alpha, n_\alpha)$.

And we verify immediately that these two correspondences are one another's inverses, noting that for $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}(\lambda)$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{D}(\lambda)$ such that $\alpha \neq \beta$, $q_\alpha \cap q_\beta = \emptyset$ holds since $\mathcal{D}(q_\alpha) \cap \mathcal{D}(q_\beta) = \emptyset$ holds by assumption.

Now in the correspondence from q to s we have that for any member α of $\mathcal{D}(\lambda)$ and any member β of λ_α, that $s_\beta = (q_\alpha)_\beta$ holds, hence we have that

$$\prod_{\alpha\in\mathcal{D}(\lambda)} \left(\sum_{q_\alpha\in F(\lambda_\alpha,n_\alpha)} \left(\prod_{\beta\in\lambda_\alpha} \left(\left(\frac{1}{(q_\alpha)_\beta!} \right) Y_\beta^{(q_\alpha)_\beta} \right) \right) \right) = \sum_{s\in G(\lambda,n)} \left(\prod_{\beta\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(T))} \left(\frac{1}{s_\beta!} \right) Y_\beta^{s_\beta} \right)$$

holds, since $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(T)) = \bigcup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{D}(\lambda)} \lambda_\alpha$.

But $\mathcal{D}(\lambda) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M))$, hence we have

$$\prod_{\alpha\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M))} \left(\left(\frac{1}{n_\alpha!} \right) \left(\sum_{\beta\in\lambda_\alpha} Y_\beta \right)^{n_\alpha} \right) = \sum_{s\in G(\lambda,n)} \left(\prod_{\beta\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(T))} \left(\frac{1}{s_\beta!} \right) Y_\beta^{s_\beta} \right).$$

Now $\mathbb{X}(T, D)$ is the set whose members are all the maps s such that $\mathcal{D}(s) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(T)) = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{D}(\lambda)} \lambda_\alpha$, and whose range is a subset of $\mathbb{N}$, and such that for each member A of $\mathcal{D}(T) = \mathcal{D}(M)$, $\sum_{\beta \in T_A} s_\beta \leq D_A$ holds. But by definition T_A is the disjoint union of the λ_α for $\alpha \in M_A$, that is, $T_A = \bigcup_{\alpha \in M_A} \lambda_\alpha$ and, for $\alpha \in M_A$ and $\beta \in M_A$ such that $\alpha \neq \beta$, $\lambda_\alpha \cap \lambda_\beta = \emptyset$ holds. Hence the constraint on s for A may be written $\sum_{\alpha \in M_A} \sum_{\beta \in \lambda_\alpha} s_\beta \leq D_A$, hence if, for all members α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M))$, $\sum_{\beta \in \lambda_\alpha} s_\beta = n_\alpha$ holds, where n is a member of $\mathbb{X}(M, D)$, then s is automatically a member of $\mathbb{X}(T, D)$.

Furthermore, if s is any member of $\mathbb{X}(T, D)$, then if we define a map n such that $\mathcal{D}(n) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M))$ and such that for each member α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M)) = \mathcal{D}(\lambda)$, $n_\alpha \equiv \sum_{\beta \in \lambda_\alpha} s_\beta$ holds, then n is automatically a member of $\mathbb{X}(M, D)$.

Hence $\mathbb{X}(T, D)$ is equal to $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{X}(M,D)} G(\lambda, n)$, hence we may express $\sum_{s \in \mathbb{X}(T,D)}$ as $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{X}(M,D)} \sum_{s \in G(\lambda,n)}$.

Hence, summing the above formula over $n \in \mathbb{X}(M, D)$, we obtain the stated result.

For any maps X and Y such that $\mathcal{R}(X) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ holds, $\mathcal{R}(Y) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ holds, and $\mathcal{D}(X) = \mathcal{D}(Y)$ holds, we define $X + Y$ to be the map whose domain is $\mathcal{D}(X)$, and such that for each member A of $\mathcal{D}(X)$, $(X + Y)_A \equiv (X_A + Y_A)$ holds, and we define X-Y to be the map whose domain is $\mathcal{D}(X)$, and such that for each member A of $\mathcal{D}(X)$, $(X - Y)_A \equiv (X_A - Y_A)$ holds.

Lemma 17. *Let V be a map such that $\mathcal{D}(V)$ is finite and such that for every member A of $\mathcal{D}(V)$, V_A is a finite set, let J be any subset of $\mathcal{D}(V)$, and let $K \equiv (\mathcal{D}(V) \vdash J)$. Let W be the map such that $\mathcal{D}(W) = K$ and such that for each member A of K, $W_A = V_A \vdash \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V, J))) = V_A \vdash \bigcup_{B \in J} V_B$ holds.*

Then $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(W)) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V)) \vdash \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V, J)))$ holds.

Furthermore, if θ is a map such that $\mathcal{D}(V) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\theta)$ holds and $\mathcal{R}(\theta) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ holds, (where $\mathbb{Z}$ is the set of all the integers), and if for each member u of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V,J)))}$, $\zeta(u)$ is a map such that $K \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\zeta(u))$ holds and such that for each member A of K, $\zeta_A(u) \equiv (\zeta(u))_A \equiv \sum_{\alpha \in V_A \cap \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V,J)))} u_\alpha$ holds, and if Y is a map such that $\mathcal{D}(Y) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))$ holds, and such that for each member α of $\mathcal{D}(Y)$, Y_α is an operator such that the Y_α obey the same commutative, associative and distributive laws of addition and multiplication as the real numbers, then the following equation holds:

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbb{X}(V,\theta)} \left(\prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))} \left(\frac{Y_\alpha^{m_\alpha}}{m_\alpha!} \right) \right) =$$

$$= \sum_{u\in\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(V,J),\theta)} \quad \sum_{v\in\mathbb{X}(W,(\theta-\zeta(u)))} \left(\prod_{\beta\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(W))} \left(\frac{Y_{\beta}^{v_{\beta}}}{v_{\beta}!}\right)\right)\left(\prod_{\alpha\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V,J)))}\left(\frac{Y_{\alpha}^{u_{\alpha}}}{u_{\alpha}!}\right)\right)$$

Proof. We first prove that $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(W)) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V)) \vdash \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V,J)))$. Let α be any member of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V)) \vdash \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V,J)))$. Then α is a member of V_A for some member A of $\mathcal{D}(V) = (J\cup K)$, but α is *not* a member of V_B for any member B of J, hence α is a member of V_A for some member A of K, hence α is a member of $W_A = V_A \vdash \bigcup_{B\in J} V_B$ for that member A of K, hence α is a member of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(W)) = \bigcup_{A\in K} W_A$. Now let α be any member of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(W))$. Then α is a member of W_A for some member A of K, hence α *is* a member of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))$, but is *not* a member of $\bigcup_{B\in J} V_B = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V,J)))$, hence α is a member of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V)) \vdash \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V,J)))$.

From this it follows immediately that the domain of each member m of $\mathbb{X}(V,\theta)$, namely $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))$, is equal to the disjoint union of the domain of each member u of $\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(V,J),\theta)$, namely $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V,J)))$, and the domain of each member v of $\mathbb{X}(W,(\theta-\zeta(u)))$, namely $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(W))$.

We now define a one-to-one correspondence between the members m of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))}$, and the set of all ordered pairs (u,v) of a member u of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V,J)))}$ and a member v of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(W))}$, by specifying that to any member m of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))}$, the corresponding such ordered pair is $(u,v) \equiv (\downarrow(m,\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V,J)))), \downarrow(m,\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(W))))$, and that to any such ordered pair (u,v), the corresponding member m of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))}$ is $m \equiv u\cup v$. We verify directly that these two correspondences are one another's inverses.

Now let m be any member of $\mathbb{X}(V,\theta)$. Then $\sum_{\alpha\in V_A} m_\alpha \leq \theta_A$ holds for every member A of $\mathcal{D}(V) = (J\cup K)$, hence if $u \equiv\downarrow(m,\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V,J))))$ and $v\equiv$ $\downarrow(m,\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(W)))$, then $\sum_{\alpha\in V_A} u_\alpha \leq \theta_A$ holds for every member A of J, hence u is a member of $\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(V,J),\theta)$, and $\left(\sum_{\alpha\in(V_A\vdash\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V,J))))} v_\alpha\right) + \left(\sum_{\alpha\in(V_A\cap\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V,J))))} u_\alpha\right) \leq$ θ_A holds for every member A of K, hence v is a member of $\mathbb{X}(W,(\theta-\zeta(u)))$. And if u is any member of $\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(V,J),\theta)$, and v is any member of $\mathbb{X}(W,(\theta-\zeta(u)))$, and we define $m\equiv u\cup v$, then we directly find that $\sum_{\alpha\in V_A} m_\alpha \leq \theta_A$ holds for every member A of $(J\cup K) = \mathcal{D}(V)$, hence m is a member of $\mathbb{X}(V,\theta)$. The equation stated follows directly from this.

For any map V such that $\mathcal{D}(V)$ is finite and for each member A of $\mathcal{D}(V)$, V_A is a finite set, we define $\psi(V)$ to be the map whose domain is equal to $\mathcal{D}(V)$, and such that for each member A of $\mathcal{D}(V)$, $\psi_A(V) \equiv (\psi(V))_A$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (α, X) of a member α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))$, and a subset X of $\mathcal{D}(V)$ such that $A \in X$ holds, and for every member B of X, $\alpha \in V_B$ holds.

We note that it follows immediately from this definition that $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (α, X) of a member α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))$, and a *nonempty* subset X of $\mathcal{D}(V)$ such that $\alpha \in V_B$ holds for every member B of X. For if (α, X) is any such ordered pair, then (α, X) is a member of $\psi_A(V)$ for every member A of the nonempty set X, hence (α, X) is certainly a member of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))$. And if (α, X) is any member of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))$, then there exists a member A of $\mathcal{D}(V)$ such that $(\alpha, X) \in \psi_A(V)$ holds, hence $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))$ holds, and $A \in X$ holds hence X is nonempty, and $\alpha \in V_B$ holds for every member B of X.

And we note furthermore that it follows immediately from the above that if A is any member of $\mathcal{D}(V)$, then $\psi_A(V)$ is the set whose members are all the members (α, X) of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))$ such that $A \in X$ holds.

For any ordered pair (V, n) of a map V such that $\mathcal{D}(V)$ is finite and every member of $\mathcal{R}(V)$ is a finite set, and a map n such that $\mathcal{D}(V) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(n)$ holds and $\mathcal{R}(n) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ holds, we define $\mathbb{A}(V, n)$ to be the set whose members are all the maps m such that $\mathcal{D}(m) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))$, $\mathcal{R}(m) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ holds, and for each member A of $\mathcal{D}(V)$, the equation $\sum_{(\alpha,X)\in\psi_A(V)} m_{(\alpha,X)} = n_A$ holds.

We shall often abbreviate $m_{(\alpha,X)}$ to $m_{\alpha X}$.

Lemma 18. Let V be a map such that $\mathcal{D}(V)$ is finite and such that for every member A of $\mathcal{D}(V)$, V_A is a finite set, let C be a map such that $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V)) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(C)$ holds, and such that for every member α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))$, C_α is the set whose members are all the members A of $\mathcal{D}(V)$ such that $\alpha \in V_A$ holds, let n be a map such that $\mathcal{D}(V) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(n)$ holds and $\mathcal{R}(n) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ holds, and let f be a map whose domain is a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))}$ and whose range is a subset of $\mathbb{R}$, such that there exists an open subset S of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))}$ such that $S \subseteq \mathcal{D}(f)$ holds, and such that all derivatives of f of degree less than or equal to $\sum_{A\in\mathcal{D}(V)} n_A$ exist and are continuous throughout S.

For any member ρ of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D}(V)}$ let $p(\rho)$ be the member of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))}$ such that for each member α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))$, $p_\alpha(\rho) \equiv (p(\rho))_\alpha \equiv \prod_{A\in C_\alpha} \rho_A$.

Then for any member ρ of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D}(V)}$ such that $p(\rho)$ is a member of S, the following equation holds:

$$\left(\prod_{A\in\mathcal{D}(V)} \left(\frac{\hat{\rho}_A^{n_A}}{n_A!}\right)\right) f(p(\rho)) =$$

$$= \sum_{m\in\mathbb{A}(V,n)}\left(\left(\prod_{(\alpha,X)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))}\left(\frac{\left(\left(\prod_{B\in(C_\alpha\vdash X)}\rho_B\right)\hat{r}_\alpha\right)^{m_{\alpha X}}}{m_{\alpha X}!}\right)\right)f\left(r\right)\right)_{r=p(\rho)}$$

Proof. The proof is by induction on $q\equiv\sum_{A\in\mathcal{D}(V)}n_A$. The equation is certainly true for $q=0$.

We shall show that if q is any member of $\mathbb{N}$, and the result is true for all members n of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{D}(V)}$ such that $\sum_{n\in\mathcal{D}(V)}n_A=q$ holds, then it is also true for all members n of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{D}(V)}$ such that $\sum_{A\in\mathcal{D}(V)}n_A=(q+1)$ holds.

For any ordered pair (ρ,m) of a member ρ of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D}(V)}$ such that $p\left(\rho\right)\in S$ holds, and a member m of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))}$, we define

$$T\left(\rho,m\right)\equiv\left(\left(\prod_{(\alpha,X)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))}\left(\frac{\left(\left(\prod_{B\in(C_\alpha\vdash X)}\rho_B\right)\hat{r}_\alpha\right)^{m_{\alpha X}}}{m_{\alpha X}!}\right)\right)f\left(r\right)\right)_{r=p(\rho)}$$

Then to prove the induction step it will be sufficient to prove that if A is any member of $\mathcal{D}\left(V\right)$, and n is any member of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{D}(V)}$ such that the result is true for n, and if we define u to be the member of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{D}(V)}$ such that $u_B\equiv n_B$ holds for all members B of $\left(\mathcal{D}\left(V\right)\vdash\{A\}\right)$ and $u_A\equiv(n_A+1)$ holds, then

$$\hat{\rho}_A\left(\sum_{m\in\mathbb{A}(V,n)}T\left(\rho,m\right)\right)=\left(n_A+1\right)\sum_{w\in\mathbb{A}(V,u)}T\left(\rho,w\right)$$

holds.

For any ordered pair (A,m) of a member A of $\mathcal{D}\left(V\right)$ and a member m of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))}$, we define $E(A,m)$ to be the set whose members are all the members (α,X) of $\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\psi\left(V\right)\right)\right)$ such that $A\in\left(C_\alpha\vdash X\right)$ holds and $m_{\alpha X}\neq0$ holds.

And for any ordered triple $(A,m,(\alpha,X))$ of a member A of $\mathcal{D}\left(V\right)$, a member m of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))}$, and a member (α,X) of $E(A,m)$, we define $s\left(A,m,(\alpha,X)\right)$ to be the member of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))}$ such that for all members (β,Y) of $\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\psi\left(V\right)\right)\right)$ such that $(\beta,Y)\neq(\alpha,X)$ holds and $(\beta,Y)\neq(\alpha,X\cup\{A\})$ holds, $s_{\beta Y}\left(A,m,(\alpha,X)\right)\equiv\left(s\left(A,m,(\alpha,X)\right)\right)_{\beta Y}\equiv m_{\beta Y}$ holds, and such that $s_{\alpha X}\left(A,m,(\alpha,X)\right)\equiv\left(m_{\alpha X}-1\right)$ holds and $\left(s\left(A,m,(\alpha,X)\right)\right)_{(\alpha,(X\cup\{A\}))}\equiv\left(m_{(\alpha,(X\cup\{A\}))}+1\right)$ holds.

From this definition it immediately follows that if A is any member of $\mathcal{D}\left(V\right)$, m is any member of $\mathbb{A}\left(V,n\right)$, and (α,X) is any member of $E\left(A,m\right)$ then $s\left(A,m,(\alpha,X)\right)$ is a member of $\mathbb{A}\left(V,u\right)$, where u is defined for A and n as above. For if B is any member of $(\mathcal{D}(V) \vdash \{A\})$, then $(\alpha, X) \in \psi_B(V)$ holds ifif $B \in X$ holds and $(\alpha, (X \cup \{A\})) \in \psi_B(V)$ holds ifif $B \in X$ holds, hence $(\alpha, X) \in \psi_B(V)$ holds ifif $(\alpha, (X \cup \{A\})) \in \psi_B(V)$ holds, hence $\sum_{(\beta,Y)\in\psi_B(V)} s_{\beta Y}(A, m, (\alpha, X)) = \sum_{(\beta,Y)\in\psi_B(V)} m_{\beta Y} = n_B = u_B$ holds, and furthermore the assumption that $A \in (C_\alpha \vdash X)$ holds implies that A is *not* a member of X, hence (α, X) is *not* a member of $\psi_A(V)$, whereas $(\alpha, (X \cup \{A\}))$ is a member of $\psi_A(V)$, hence $\sum_{(\beta,Y)\in\psi_A(V)} s_{\beta Y}(A, m, (\alpha, X)) = \left(\sum_{(\beta,Y)\in\psi_A(V)} m_{\beta Y}\right) + 1 = (n_A + 1) = u_A$ holds.

For any ordered triple (A, m, α) of a member A of $\mathcal{D}(V)$, a member m of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))}$, and a member α of V_A, (or in other words a member α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))$ such that $A \in C_\alpha$ holds), we define $t(A, m, \alpha)$ to be the member of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))}$ such that for every member (β, Y) of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))$ such that $(\beta, Y) \neq (\alpha, \{A\})$ holds, $t_{\beta Y}(A, m, \alpha) \equiv m_{\beta Y}$ holds, and such that $t_{\alpha\{A\}}(A, m, \alpha) \equiv \left(m_{\alpha\{A\}} + 1\right)$ holds.

It immediately follows from this definition that if A is any member of $\mathcal{D}(V)$, m is any member of $\mathbb{A}(V, n)$, and α is any member of V_A, then $t(A, m, \alpha)$ is a member of $\mathbb{A}(V, u)$. For if B is any member of $(\mathcal{D}(V) \vdash \{A\})$, then $(\alpha, \{A\})$ is *not* a member of $\psi_B(V)$, hence $\sum_{(\beta,Y)\in\psi_B(V)} t_{\beta Y}(A, m, \alpha) = \sum_{(\beta,Y)\in\psi_B(V)} m_{\beta Y} = n_B = u_B$ holds, and furthermore $(\alpha, \{A\})$ *is* a member of $\psi_A(V)$, hence $\sum_{(\beta,Y)\in\psi_A(V)} t_{\beta Y}(A, m, \alpha) = \left(\sum_{(\beta,Y)\in\psi_A(V)} m_{\beta Y}\right) + 1 = (n_A + 1) = u_A$ holds.

Furthermore, it follows directly from these definitions that

$$\hat{\rho}_A T(\rho, m) = \left(\sum_{(\alpha,X)\in E(A,m)} \left(m_{(\alpha,(X\cup\{A\}))} + 1\right) T(\rho, s(A, m, (\alpha, X)))\right) + \\ + \left(\sum_{\alpha\in V_A} \left(m_{\alpha\{A\}} + 1\right) T(\rho, t(A, m, \alpha))\right)$$

holds. For when $\hat{\rho}_A$ acts on

$$T(\rho, m) = \left(\left(\prod_{(\alpha,X)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))} \left(\frac{\left(\left(\prod_{B\in(C_\alpha\vdash X)} \rho_B\right) \hat{r}_\alpha\right)^{m_{\alpha X}}}{m_{\alpha X}!}\right)\right) f(r)\right)_{r=p(\rho)},$$

it can either act on a factor ρ_A in the factor associated with some member (α, X) of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))$, or it can act on $(f(r))_{r=p(\rho)} = f(p(\rho))$.

Now if $\hat{\rho}_A$ acts on the factor associated with the member (α, X) of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))$, it produces nothing unless A is a member of $(C_\alpha \vdash X)$ and $m_{\alpha X} \neq 0$ holds, or in other words, it produces nothing unless $(\alpha, X) \in E(A, m)$ holds. And if $(\alpha, X) \in E(A, m)$

holds, it produces $T\left(\rho, s\left(A, m, (\alpha, X)\right)\right)$, up to a ρ-independent factor. And to determine this ρ-independent factor, we note firstly that there is a numerator factor of $m_{\alpha X}$ from the exponent $m_{\alpha X}$. Now in $T(\rho, m)$, the denominator factor in the factor associated with (α, X) is $m_{\alpha X}!$, whereas in $T\left(\rho, s\left(A, m, (\alpha, X)\right)\right)$, the denominator factor in the factor associated with (α, X) is $(m_{\alpha X} - 1)!$. Hence the numerator factor of $m_{\alpha X}$ combines with the denominator factor $m_{\alpha X}!$ in $T(\rho, m)$ to produce the denominator factor $(m_{\alpha X} - 1)!$ in $T\left(\rho, s\left(A, m, (\alpha, X)\right)\right)$. And in $T(\rho, m)$, the denominator factor in the factor associated with $(\alpha, (X \cup \{A\}))$ is $m_{(\alpha,(X\cup\{A\}))}!$, whereas in $T\left(\rho, s\left(A, m, (\alpha, X)\right)\right)$ the denominator factor in the factor associated with $(\alpha, (X \cup \{A\}))$ is $\left(m_{(\alpha,(X\cup\{A\}))} + 1\right)!$. Hence the overall factor is $\left(m_{(\alpha,(X\cup\{A\}))} + 1\right)$.

And if $\hat{\rho}_A$ acts on $f(p(\rho))$, we have, by the chain rule for differentiation,

$$\hat{\rho}_A f(p(\rho)) = \sum_{\alpha\in V_A} \left(\prod_{B\in(C_\alpha \vdash \{A\})} \rho_B \right) \left(\hat{r}_\alpha f(r)\right)_{r=p(\rho)},$$

and the term associated with α in this expression produces $T(\rho, t(A, m, \alpha))$, apart from a ρ-independent factor. And to determine this ρ-independent factor, we note that in $T(\rho, m)$ the denominator factor in the factor associated with $(\alpha, \{A\})$ is $m_{(\alpha,\{A\})}!$, whereas in $T(\rho, t(A, m, \alpha))$ the denominator factor in the factor associated with $(\alpha, \{A\})$ is $\left(m_{(\alpha,\{A\})} + 1\right)!$, hence the overall factor is $\left(m_{(\alpha,\{A\})} + 1\right)$.

We note, furthermore, that the coefficient $\left(m_{(\alpha,(X\cup\{A\}))}+1\right)$ of $T\left(\rho, s\left(A, m, (\alpha, X)\right)\right)$ in the above expression for $\hat{\rho}_A T(\rho, m)$, is equal to $\left(s\left(A, m, (\alpha, X)\right)\right)_{(\alpha,(X\cup\{A\}))}$, and that the coefficient $\left(m_{(\alpha,\{A\})} + 1\right)$ of $T(\rho, t(A, m, \alpha))$ in the above expression for $\hat{\rho}_A T(\rho, m)$, is equal to $\left(t(A, m, \alpha)\right)_{\alpha\{A\}}$.

Thus $\hat{\rho}_A \left(\sum_{m\in\mathbb{A}(V,n)} T(\rho, m)\right)$ is equal to the sum, over the members w of $\mathbb{A}(V, u)$, of $T(\rho, w)$ times a ρ-independent coefficient.

Now let w be any member of $\mathbb{A}(V, u)$. To determine the total coefficient of $T(\rho, w)$, we shall identify all the members m of $\mathbb{A}(V, n)$ such that w is equal to $s\left(A, m, (\alpha, X)\right)$ for some member (α, X) of $E(A, m)$, and all the members m of $\mathbb{A}(V, n)$ such that w is equal to $t(A, m, \alpha)$ for some member α of V_A.

Let (α, X) be any member of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))$. Then if m is a member of $\mathbb{A}(V, n)$ such that $s\left(A, m, (\alpha, X)\right) = w$, then we must have $m_{\beta Y} = w_{\beta Y}$ when $(\beta, Y) \neq (\alpha, X)$ and $(\beta, Y) \neq (\alpha, (X \cup \{A\}))$, and we must also have $m_{\alpha X} = (w_{\alpha X} + 1)$ and $m_{(\alpha,(X\cup\{A\}))} = \left(w_{(\alpha,(X\cup\{A\}))} - 1\right)$. Furthermore we must have $A \in (C_\alpha \vdash X)$, and $w_{(\alpha,(X\cup\{A\}))} \neq 0$.

If these requirements are satisfied, then $\hat{\rho}_A T(\rho, m)$ contains $T(\rho, w)$ with coefficient

$w_{(\alpha,(X\cup\{A\}))}$, while if these requirements are not satisfied, then $\hat{\rho}_A T(\rho,m)$ does not contain $T(\rho,w)$.

Now let α be any member of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))$. Then if m is a member of $\mathbb{A}(V,n)$ such that $t(A,m,\alpha)=w$, then we must have $\alpha\in V_A$, (or equivalently $A\in C_\alpha$), and we must have $m_{\beta Y}=w_{\beta Y}$ for $(\beta,Y)\neq(\alpha,X)$, and we must also have $m_{\alpha\{A\}}=\left(w_{\alpha\{A\}}-1\right)$. Furthermore we must also have $w_{\alpha\{A\}}\neq 0$.

If these requirements are satisfied, then $\hat{\rho}_A T(\rho,m)$ contains $T(\rho,w)$ with coefficient $w_{\alpha\{A\}}$, while if these requirements are not satisfied, then $\hat{\rho}_A T(\rho,m)$ does not contain $T(\rho,w)$.

Thus the total coefficient of $T(\rho,w)$ in $\hat{\rho}_A\left(\sum_{m\in\mathbb{A}(V,n)}T(\rho,m)\right)$ is equal to the sum over all members (α,X) of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))$ such that $A\in(C_\alpha\vdash X)$ holds, of $w_{(\alpha,(X\cup\{A\}))}$, plus the sum over all members α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))$ such that $A\in C_\alpha$ holds, of $w_{\alpha\{A\}}$. But this is precisely equal to the sum over all members (α,Y) of $\psi_A(V)$, of $w_{\alpha Y}$, and by the definition of $\mathbb{A}(V,u)$, this is equal to $u_A=(n_A+1)$.

We observe that, if J and K are any two sets such that $J\cap K=\emptyset$, then $\mathcal{U}\left(\{0\}^J\cup\{1\}^K\right)$ is the unique map M whose domain is $(J\cup K)$, and such that for each member A of J, $M_A=0$ holds, and for each member A of K, $M_A=1$ holds. For $\{0\}^J$ is the set whose members are all the maps P such that $\mathcal{D}(P)=J$ holds and $\mathcal{R}(P)\subseteq\{0\}$ holds. But there is only one such map, namely the unique map P such that $\mathcal{D}(P)=J$ holds, and $P_A=0$ holds for every member A of J. Similarly the set $\{1\}^K$ has exactly one member, namely the unique map Q such that $\mathcal{D}(Q)=K$ holds, and $Q_A=1$ holds for every member A of K. Furthermore $P\neq Q$ holds provided J and K are not both equal to the empty set $\emptyset$, for $J\cap K=\emptyset$ implies that $J\neq K$ holds unless J and K are both equal to the empty set $\emptyset$. Hence if J and K are not both equal to the empty set $\emptyset$, then the set $\{0\}^J\cup\{1\}^K$ has exactly two members, namely the two maps P and Q, whose union is equal to the map M, hence $\mathcal{U}\left(\{0\}^J\cup\{1\}^K\right)=M$. And if J and K are both equal to the empty set $\emptyset$, then $\{0\}^J\cup\{1\}^K$ has the one member $\emptyset$, hence $\mathcal{U}\left(\{0\}^J\cup\{1\}^K\right)=\emptyset$ holds, and furthermore the map M is equal to the empty set $\emptyset$ in this case.

Lemma 19. Let V be a map such that $\mathcal{D}(V)$ is finite and such that for every member A of $\mathcal{D}(V)$, V_A is a finite set, let θ be a map such that $\mathcal{D}(V)\subseteq\mathcal{D}(\theta)$ holds and $\mathcal{R}(\theta)\subseteq\mathbb{N}$ holds, and let f be a map whose domain is a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))}$ and whose range is a subset of $\mathbb{R}$, such that there exists an open subset S of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))}$ such that

$S \subseteq \mathcal{D}(f)$ holds, and such that all derivatives of f of degree less than or equal to $\sum_{A \in \mathcal{D}(V)} \theta_A$ exist and are continuous throughout S.

For any member ρ of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D}(V)}$ let $p(\rho)$ be the member of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))}$ such that for each member α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))$, $p_\alpha(\rho) \equiv (p(\rho))_\alpha$ is equal to the product of ρ_A over all the members A of $\mathcal{D}(V)$ such that $\alpha \in V_A$ holds.

Let J be any subset of $\mathcal{D}(V)$, and let $K \equiv (\mathcal{D}(V) \vdash J)$. We assume furthermore that $p\left(\mathcal{U}\left(\{0\}^J \cup \{1\}^K\right)\right)$ is a member of S. Then the following equation holds:

$$\left(\left(\prod_{A \in J}\left(\sum_{n_A=0}^{\theta_A} \frac{\hat{\rho}_A^{n_A}}{n_A!}\right)\right) f(p(\rho))\right)_{\rho=\mathcal{U}\left(\{0\}^J \cup \{1\}^K\right)} =$$

$$= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{X}(\downarrow(V,J),\theta)} \left(\left(\prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V,J)))} \left(\frac{\hat{r}_\alpha^{m_\alpha}}{m_\alpha!}\right)\right) f(r)\right)_{r=p\left(\mathcal{U}\left(\{0\}^J \cup \{1\}^K\right)\right)}$$

Proof. For any ordered pair (W, n) of a map W such that $\mathcal{D}(W)$ is finite, and every member of $\mathcal{R}(W)$ is a finite set, and a map n such that $\mathcal{D}(W) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(n)$ holds, and $\mathcal{R}(n)$ is a subset of the set $\mathbb{Z}$ of all the integers, we define $H(W, n)$ to be the set whose members are all the maps p such that $\mathcal{D}(p) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(W))$ holds, $\mathcal{R}(p) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ holds, and for every member A of $\mathcal{D}(W)$, $\sum_{\alpha \in W_A} p_\alpha = n_A$ holds.

We note that this definition has the immediate consequence that if, for any member A of $\mathcal{D}(W)$, $n_A < 0$ holds, then $H(V, n)$ is the empty set, since there is no map p with the required properties.

And we observe that $\mathbb{X}(W, n)$ is the disjoint union of $H(W, m)$ over the set whose members are all the members m of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{D}(W)}$ such that for every member A of $\mathcal{D}(W)$, $m_A \leq n_A$ holds.

We define C to be the map whose domain is $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))$, and such that for each member α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))$, C_α is the set whose members are all the members A of $\mathcal{D}(V)$ such that $\alpha \in V_A$ holds, so that C satisfies the requirements on the map C in Lemma 18, and we consider Lemma 18 when n is any member of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{D}(V)} = \mathbb{N}^{(J \cup K)}$ such that $n_A = 0$ holds for every member A of K, and ρ is any member of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D}(V)}$ such that $\rho_A = 0$ holds for every member A of J.

Now $\psi(V)$ is the map whose domain is equal to $\mathcal{D}(V)$, and for each member A of $\mathcal{D}(V)$, $\psi_A(V)$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (α, X) of a member α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))$, and a subset X of $\mathcal{D}(V)$ such that $A \in X$ holds, and for every member

B of X, $\alpha \in V_B$ holds. And $\mathbb{A}(V, n)$ is the set whose members are all the maps m such that $\mathcal{D}(m) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))$, $\mathcal{R}(m) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ holds, and for each member A of $\mathcal{D}(V)$, the equation $\sum_{(\alpha,X)\in\psi_A(V)} m_{\alpha X} = n_A$ holds.

From this it immediately follows that if m is any member of $\mathbb{A}(V, n)$ in the present case, and (α, X) is any member of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))$, then $m_{\alpha X}$ vanishes unless X contains *no* member of K, or in other words, $m_{\alpha X}$ vanishes unless $X \subseteq J$ holds. Furthermore, the term associated with m in the sum over $\mathbb{A}(V, n)$ vanishes when $\rho_A = 0$ holds for every member A of J, unless $m_{\alpha X} = 0$ holds for every member (α, X) of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))$ such that $(C_\alpha \vdash X)$ contains any member of J, or in other words, the term associated with m in the sum over $\mathbb{A}(V, n)$ vanishes when $\rho_A = 0$ holds for every member A of J, unless $m_{\alpha X} = 0$ holds for every member (α, X) of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))$ such that X does not contain *all* the members A of J such that $\alpha \in V_A$ holds. Thus in the present case the sum over the members m of $\mathbb{A}(V, n)$ becomes a sum over maps m whose domain is the set of all the ordered pairs (α, X) of a member α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))$, and a nonempty set X whose members are precisely those members A of J such that $\alpha \in V_A$ holds. Thus there is at most one possible ordered pair (α, X) for each member α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))$, namely the ordered pair (α, X) where X is the set of all the members A of J such that $\alpha \in V_A$ holds, *provided this set is nonempty.* Thus the set of these ordered pairs (α, X) is in one-to-one correspondence with the set $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V, J)))$, namely the set of all the members α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(V))$ such that α is a member of V_A for at least one member A of J. To each such member m of $\mathbb{A}(V, n)$ we define the corresponding member n of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V,J)))}$ by the requirement that for each member α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V, J)))$, $p_\alpha = m_{\alpha X}$ holds, where X is the set of all the members A of J such that $\alpha \in V_A$ holds, (and the fact that α is a member of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V, J)))$ guarantees that X is nonempty).

Now the constraints on m associated with the members of K have been satisfied by requiring $m_{\alpha X}$ to be equal to 0 if X contains any member of K, hence the maps p are only constrained by the constraints associated with the members of J. And the constraint on the map p associated with the member A of J is that the sum of p_α over all members α of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V, J)))$ such that the corresponding (α, X) is a member of $\psi_A(V)$, be equal to n_A. But a member (α, X) of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(V)))$ is a member of $\psi_A(V)$ iff $A \in X$ holds, and in the present case, X is the set of all the members B of J such that $\alpha \in V_B$ holds, hence (α, X) is a member of $\psi_A(V)$ iff $\alpha \in V_A$ holds, thus the constraint on the map p associated with the member A of J is $\sum_{\alpha\in V_A} p_\alpha = n_A$.

Thus the maps p are precisely the members of $H(\downarrow(V, J), n)$, and the following equation holds:

$$\left(\left(\prod_{A\in J}\left(\frac{\hat{\rho}_A^{n_A}}{n_A!}\right)\right)f\left(p\left(\rho\right)\right)\right)_{\rho=\mathcal{U}\left(\{0\}^J\cup\{1\}^K\right)} =$$

$$= \sum_{m\in H(\downarrow(V,J),n)}\left(\left(\prod_{\alpha\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V,J)))}\left(\frac{\hat{r}_\alpha^{m_\alpha}}{m_\alpha!}\right)\right)f\left(r\right)\right)_{r=p\left(\mathcal{U}\left(\{0\}^J\cup\{1\}^K\right)\right)}$$

And summing this equation over all members n of $\mathbb{N}^J$ such that $n_A \leq \theta_A$ holds for every member A of J, we obtain the stated result.

We recall from page 21 that for any ordered pair (F, i) of a set F such that every member of F is a set, and a member i of $\mathcal{U}(F)$, we define $\mathcal{C}(F, i)$ to be the intersection of all the members A of F such that $i \in A$ holds, and we note that if F is a *wood,* then $\mathcal{C}(F, i)$ is equal to the unique member A of $\mathcal{M}(F)$ such that $i \in A$ holds.

And we recall from page 25 that for any ordered pair (A, H) of a set A, and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathcal{T}(A, H)$ to be the subset of A whose members are all the members i of A such that there is *no* member B of H such that $i \in B$ and $B \subseteq A$ both hold.

And we also recall from page 25 that for any ordered pair (F, H) of a wood F, and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathcal{O}(F, H)$ to be the set whose members are all the members i of $\mathcal{U}(F)$ such that there *exists* a member A of F such that $i \in A$ holds and there is *no* member B of H such that $i \in B$ and $B \subseteq A$ both hold, and we note that it immediately follows from this definition that the equation $\mathcal{O}(F, H) = \bigcup_{A\in F}\mathcal{T}(A, H)$ holds.

Furthermore, we observe that if F is any wood and H is any set such that every member of H is a set, then $\mathcal{O}(F, H) = \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{M}(F), H)$ holds. For $\mathcal{M}(F)$ is a subset of F, hence $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{M}(F), H) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(F, H)$ certainly holds, and if i is any member of $\mathcal{U}(F)$ and A is any member of F such that $i \in A$ holds, then the member $\mathcal{C}(F, i)$ of $\mathcal{M}(F)$ is a subset of A, hence if there is no member B of H such that $i \in B$ and $B \subseteq A$ both hold, then there is certainly no member B of H such that $i \in B$ and $B \subseteq \mathcal{C}(F, i)$ both hold. Hence if there exists a member of F that has i as a member and does not contain as a subset any member of H that has i as a member, then there exists a member of $\mathcal{M}(F)$ that has i as a member and does not contain as a subset any member of H that has i as a member.

And we note furthermore that it immediately follows from the preceding paragraph that if F and G are any woods such that $\mathcal{M}(F) = \mathcal{M}(G)$ holds, and H is a set such that every member of H is a set, then $\mathcal{O}(F, H) = \mathcal{O}(G, H)$ holds.

We also recall from page 25 that for any ordered triple (F, H, i) of a wood F, a set H such that every member of H is a set, and a member i of $\mathcal{O}(F, H)$, we define $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ to be the *largest* member A of F such that $i \in A$ holds and there is *no* member B of H such that $i \in B$ and $B \subseteq A$ both hold, and we note that it immediately follows from this definition that $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ is the *largest* member A of F such that $i \in \mathcal{T}(A, H)$ holds.

We recall from page 21 that for any set F such that every member of F is a set, we define $\mathbb{B}(F)$ to be equal to $(F \vdash \mathcal{M}(F))$.

And we recall from page 26 that for any ordered triple (F, A, B) of a wood F, a *nonempty* set A, and a set B, we define $\mathbb{Y}(F, A, B)$ to be the set whose members are all the members C of F such that $A \subset C$ and $C \subseteq B$ both hold, and we note that $\mathbb{Y}(F, A, B)$ is equal to the empty set $\emptyset$ if $A \subset B$ does *not* hold. And we note furthermore that if C and D are any two distinct members of $\mathbb{Y}(F, A, B)$, then C and D are members of F hence do not overlap, and $C \cap D$ contains as a subset the nonempty set A, hence either $C \subset D$ holds or $D \subset C$ holds.

For any ordered pair (F, H) of a wood F and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathbb{I}(F, H)$ to be the map whose domain is $\mathbb{B}(F) = (F \vdash \mathcal{M}(F))$, and such that for each member A of $\mathbb{B}(F)$, $\mathbb{I}_A(F, H) \equiv (\mathbb{I}(F, H))_A$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (i, B) of a member i of $\mathcal{T}(A, H)$ and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}(F, \mathcal{C}(F, i), A)$.

Lemma 20. Let Q be any wood, let F be any wood such that $\mathcal{M}(F) = \mathcal{M}(Q)$ holds and $F \subseteq Q$ holds, and let H be any set such that every member of H is a set. Then $\bigcup_{A \in \mathbb{B}(F)} \mathbb{I}_A(Q, H)$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (i, B) of a member i of $\mathcal{O}(Q, H)$ and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{C}(F, i), \mathcal{Z}(F, H, i))$.

Proof. Let (i, B) be any member of $\bigcup_{A \in \mathbb{B}(F)} \mathbb{I}_A(Q, H)$. Then there exists a member A of F such that $(i, B) \in \mathbb{I}_A(Q, H)$ holds. Let A be a member of F such that $(i, B) \in \mathbb{I}_A(Q, H)$ holds. Then $i \in \mathcal{T}(A, H)$ holds and $B \in \mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{C}(Q, i), A)$ holds. Now $i \in \mathcal{T}(A, H)$ implies directly that $i \in \mathcal{O}(F, H)$ holds, hence that $i \in \mathcal{O}(Q, H)$ holds. And $i \in \mathcal{O}(F, H)$ implies that $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ is the largest member C of F such that $i \in \mathcal{T}(F, C)$ holds, hence $A \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ holds. But $B \in \mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{C}(Q, i), A)$ holds, hence $\mathcal{C}\left(Q,i\right)\subset B\subseteq A$ holds, hence $\mathcal{C}\left(Q,i\right)\subset B\subseteq\mathcal{Z}\left(F,H,i\right)$ holds, hence $B\in\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(Q,i\right),\mathcal{Z}\left(F,H,i\right)\right)$ holds.

Now let $\left(i,B\right)$ be any ordered pair such that $i\in\mathcal{O}\left(Q,H\right)$ holds and $B\in\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(Q,i\right),\mathcal{Z}\left(F,H,i\right)\right)$ holds. Then $i\in\mathcal{O}\left(F,H\right)$ holds hence $\mathcal{Z}\left(F,H,i\right)$ is the largest member A of F such that $i\in\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)$ holds, hence $i\in\mathcal{T}\left(\mathcal{Z}\left(F,H,i\right),H\right)$ holds. Hence $\left(i,B\right)\in\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Z}\left(F,H,i\right)}\left(Q,H\right)$ holds, hence $\left(i,B\right)\in\bigcup_{A\in\mathbb{B}\left(F\right)}\mathbb{I}_{A}\left(Q,H\right)$ holds.

We now observe that if Q is any wood, F is any wood such that $\mathcal{M}\left(F\right)=\mathcal{M}\left(Q\right)$ holds and $F\subseteq Q$ holds, and H is any set such that every member of H is a set, then $\downarrow\left(\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right),F\right)$, the restriction of $\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right)$ to the domain $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right)\right)\cap F=\mathbb{B}\left(F\right)$, is the map whose domain is $\mathbb{B}\left(F\right)$, and such that for each member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(F\right)$, $\left(\downarrow\left(\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right),F\right)\right)_{A}=\mathbb{I}_{A}\left(Q,H\right)$ holds.

Now if M is any map such that every member of $\mathcal{R}\left(M\right)$ is a set, then the equation $\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(M\right)\right)=\bigcup_{A\in\mathcal{D}\left(M\right)}M_{A}$ holds.

Hence if Q is any wood, F is any wood such that $\mathcal{M}\left(F\right)=\mathcal{M}\left(Q\right)$ holds and $F\subseteq Q$ holds, and H is any set such that every member of H is a set, then the equation $\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\downarrow\left(\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right),F\right)\right)\right)=\bigcup_{A\in\mathbb{B}\left(F\right)}\mathbb{I}_{A}\left(Q,H\right)$ holds. Hence by Lemma 20, $\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\downarrow\left(\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right),F\right)\right)\right)$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs $\left(i,B\right)$ of a member i of $\mathcal{O}\left(Q,H\right)$ and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(Q,i\right),\mathcal{Z}\left(F,H,i\right)\right)$.

Furthermore, if Q is any wood, and H is any set such that every member of H is a set, then $\downarrow\left(\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right),Q\right)=\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right)$ holds, hence $\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right)\right)\right)$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs $\left(i,B\right)$ of a member i of $\mathcal{O}\left(Q,H\right)$ and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(Q,i\right),\mathcal{Z}\left(Q,H,i\right)\right)$.

For any ordered triple $\left(P,Q,H\right)$ of a wood P, a wood Q such that $\mathcal{M}\left(Q\right)=\mathcal{M}\left(P\right)$ holds and $P\subseteq Q$ holds, and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right)$ to be the set whose domain is $\left(Q\vdash P\right)$, and such that for each member A of $\left(Q\vdash P\right)$, $\mathbb{J}_{A}\left(P,Q,H\right)\equiv\left(\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right)\right)_{A}$ is defined by the equation:

$$\mathbb{J}_{A}\left(P,Q,H\right)\equiv\left(\mathbb{I}_{A}\left(Q,H\right)\vdash\bigcup_{B\in\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)}\mathbb{I}_{B}\left(Q,H\right)\right)$$

Thus, by Lemma 20, $\mathbb{J}_{A}\left(P,Q,H\right)$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs $\left(i,B\right)$ of a member i of $\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)$, and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(Q,i\right),A\right)$ such that B is *not* a member of $\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(Q,i\right),\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,i\right)\right)$.

Now there is no such B unless $\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,i\right)\subset A$ holds, hence i is a member of $\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)$ such that $\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,i\right)\subset A$ holds. Now $i\in\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)$ implies $i\in\mathcal{O}\left(Q,H\right)$, hence $i \in \mathcal{O}(P, H)$, hence $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i)$ is the largest member C of P such that $i \in \mathcal{T}(C, H)$ holds. Hence the requirement that $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i) \subset A$ holds, is equivalent to the requirement that there is *no* member C of P such that $A \subseteq C$ holds and $i \in \mathcal{T}(C, H)$ holds.

Thus $\mathbb{J}_A(P, Q, H)$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (i, B) of a member i of $\mathcal{T}(A, H)$ such that there is no member C of P such that $A \subseteq C$ holds and $i \in \mathcal{T}(C, H)$ holds, and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{C}(Q, i), A)$ such that B is not a member of $\mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{C}(Q, i), \mathcal{Z}(P, H, i))$. Now $A \in (Q \vdash P)$ holds hence the requirement that there is no member C of P such that $A \subseteq C$ holds and $i \in \mathcal{T}(C, H)$ holds, implies that $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i) \subset A$ holds, hence B is a member of $\mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{Z}(P, H, i), A)$. Furthermore, there is no member D of P such that $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i) \subset D \subset A$ holds, for if there was such a member D of P then $i \in D$ would hold and $i \in \mathcal{T}(D, H)$ would hold, (for if there was a member E of H such that $i \in E$ and $E \subseteq D$ both held, then $i \in E$ and $E \subseteq A$ would both hold, contradicting $i \in \mathcal{T}(A, H)$), and this contradicts the fact that by definition $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i)$ is the *largest* member D of P such that $i \in \mathcal{T}(D, H)$ holds. Hence $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i)$ is equal to $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$, which by the definition on page 25, is the largest member D of P such that $i \in D$ and $D \subset A$ both hold.

Hence $\mathbb{J}_A(P, Q, H)$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (i, B) of a member i of $\mathcal{T}(A, H)$ such that there is no member C of P such that $A \subseteq C$ holds and $i \in \mathcal{T}(C, H)$ holds, and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{K}(P, A, i), A)$.

We recall from page 24 that for any ordered pair (F, B) of a wood F and a *nonempty* set B, we define $\mathcal{Y}(F, B)$ to be the *smallest* member A of F such that $B \subseteq A$ holds, if any members A of F exist such that $B \subseteq A$ holds, and to be equal to the empty set $\emptyset$ if there are *no* members A of F such that $B \subseteq A$ holds.

And we observe that it immediately follows from this definition and the preceding paragraph, that $\mathbb{J}_A(P, Q, H)$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (i, B) of a member i of $(\mathcal{T}(A, H) \vdash \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P, A), H))$, and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{K}(P, A, i), A)$, for if i is a member of $\mathcal{T}(A, H)$ such that there is no member C of P such that $A \subseteq C$ holds and $i \in \mathcal{T}(C, H)$ holds, then either there is no member C of P such that $A \subseteq C$ holds, in which case $\mathcal{Y}(P, A) = \emptyset$ holds and $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P, A), H) = \mathcal{T}(\emptyset, H) = \emptyset$ holds, hence i is a member of $(\mathcal{T}(A, H) \vdash \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P, A), H)) = \mathcal{T}(A, H)$, or else there is at least one member C of P such that $A \subseteq C$ holds, in which case i is *not* a member of $\mathcal{T}(C, H)$ for any such member C of P, and in particular i is not a member of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P, A), H)$, (for in this case $\mathcal{Y}(P, A)$ is by definition the smallest such member of

P), hence again i is a member of $(\mathcal{T}(A,H) \vdash \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A),H))$, and if i is a member of $(\mathcal{T}(A,H) \vdash \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A),H))$, then i is a member of $\mathcal{T}(A,H)$ but *not* a member of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A),H)$, hence either $\mathcal{Y}(P,A) = \emptyset$ holds, in which case there is *no* member C of P such that $A \subseteq C$ holds, hence in particular there is *no* member C of P such that $A \subseteq C$ and $i \in \mathcal{T}(C,H)$ both hold, or else $\mathcal{Y}(P,A) \neq \emptyset$ holds, in which case there exists at least one member C of P such that $A \subseteq C$ holds, and $\mathcal{Y}(P,A)$ is the *smallest* member C of P such that $A \subseteq C$ holds, and i is *not* a member of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A),H)$, hence since $i \in \mathcal{Y}(P,A)$ certainly holds in this case, there exists a member B of H such that $i \in B$ and $B \subseteq \mathcal{Y}(P,A)$ both hold, hence for *every* member C of P such that $A \subseteq C$ holds, there exists a member B of H such that $i \in B$ and $B \subseteq C$ both hold, hence again there is *no* member C of P such that $A \subseteq C$ and $i \in \mathcal{T}(C,H)$ both hold.

Lemma 21. Let P be any wood, Q be any wood such that $\mathcal{M}(Q) = \mathcal{M}(P)$ holds and $P \subseteq Q$ holds, F be any member of $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$, and H be any set such that every member of H is a set. Then $\bigcup_{A \in (F \vdash P)} \mathbb{J}_A(P,Q,H)$ is equal to $\left(\bigcup_{A \in \mathbb{B}(F)} \mathbb{I}_A(Q,H)\right) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{A \in \mathbb{B}(P)} \mathbb{I}_A(Q,H)\right)$, and is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (i,B) of a member i of $\mathcal{O}(Q,H)$ and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{Z}(P,H,i), \mathcal{Z}(F,H,i))$.

Proof. For any member A of $(Q \vdash P)$, $\mathbb{J}_A(P,Q,H)$ is by definition equal to $\left(\mathbb{I}_A(Q,H) \vdash \bigcup_{B \in \mathbb{B}(P)} \mathbb{I}_B(Q,H)\right)$. Now suppose α is a member of $\mathbb{I}_A(Q,H)$ for some member A of $\mathbb{B}(F)$, and that α is *not* a member of $\bigcup_{B \in \mathbb{B}(P)} \mathbb{I}_B(Q,H)$. Then A is not a member of $\mathbb{B}(P)$ hence A is a member of $(F \vdash P)$, and α is a member of $\mathbb{J}_A(P,Q,H)$, hence is a member of $\bigcup_{A \in (F \vdash P)} \mathbb{J}_A(P,Q,H)$. Now let α be any member of $\bigcup_{B \in \mathbb{B}(P)} \mathbb{I}_B(Q,H)$. Then α is *not* a member of $\mathbb{J}_A(P,Q,H)$ for any member A of $(F \vdash P)$, hence α is *not* a member of $\bigcup_{A \in (F \vdash P)} \mathbb{J}_A(P,Q,H)$.

Finally we note that it follows directly from Lemma 20 that $\left(\bigcup_{A \in \mathbb{B}(F)} \mathbb{I}_A(Q,H)\right) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{A \in \mathbb{B}(P)} \mathbb{I}_A(Q,H)\right)$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (i,B) of a member i of $\mathcal{O}(Q,H)$ and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{Z}(P,H,i), \mathcal{Z}(F,H,i))$.

For any ordered quintuple (P,Q,H,x,r) of a wood P, a wood Q such that $\mathcal{M}(Q) = \mathcal{M}(P)$ holds and $P \subseteq Q$ holds, a set H such that every member of H is a set, a member x of $\mathbb{F}_d(\mathcal{M}(P))$, where d is an integer ≥ 1, and a member r of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H)))}$, (or in other words, a map r whose domain is the set of all ordered pairs (i,A) of a member i of $\mathcal{O}(P,H) = \mathcal{O}(Q,H)$ and a member A of $\mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{Z}(P,H,i), \mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i))$, and whose range is a subset of $\mathbb{R}$), we define the member $\mu(P,Q,H,x,r)$ of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(P)}$ by:

$$\mu_i(P,Q,H,x,r) \equiv \begin{cases} x_{\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i)} + \sum_{A\in\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i))} r_{iA}\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)} - x_A\right) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{O}(P,H) \\ x_{\mathcal{C}(P,i)} & \text{if } i \in (\mathcal{U}(P) \vdash \mathcal{O}(P,H)) \end{cases}$$

where $\mu_i(P,Q,H,x,r) \equiv (\mu(P,Q,H,x,r))_i$.

For every ordered triple (F,H,x) of a wood F, a set H such that every member of H is a set, and a member x of $\mathbb{F}_d(\mathcal{M}(F))$, where d is an integer ≥ 1, we define the member $\eta(F,H,x)$ of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(F)}$ by:

$$\eta_i(F,H,x) \equiv (\eta(F,H,x))_i \equiv \begin{cases} x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{O}(F,H) \\ x_{\mathcal{C}(F,i)} & \text{if } i \in (\mathcal{U}(F) \vdash \mathcal{O}(F,H)) \end{cases}$$

We observe that if P and Q are any woods such that $\mathcal{M}(Q) = \mathcal{M}(P)$ and $P \subseteq Q$ both hold, F is any member of $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$, H is any set such that every member of H is a set, x is any member of $\mathbb{F}_d(\mathcal{M}(P))$, where d is an integer ≥ 1, and r is the particular member of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H)))}$ such that for each member i of $\mathcal{O}(P,H)$, $r_{iB} = 0$ holds for all members B of $\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i))$, and $r_{iB} = 1$ holds for all members B of $\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i))$, or in other words, if $r = \mathcal{U}\left(\{0\}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{J}(P,F,H)))} \cup \{1\}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{J}(F,Q,H)))}\right)$, then the equation $\mu(P,Q,H,x,r) = \eta(F,H,x)$ holds.

For any ordered pair (Q,H) of a wood Q and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathbb{G}(Q,H)$ to be the map whose domain is the set of all ordered pairs (i,B) of a member i of $\mathcal{O}(Q,H)$ and a member B of Q, and such that for each member (i,B) of $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{G}(Q,H))$, $\mathbb{G}_{iB}(Q,H)$ is the set whose members are all the members A of Q such that $B \subseteq A$ and $A \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i)$ both hold. (Thus $\mathbb{G}_{iB}(Q,H)$ is the empty set $\emptyset$ if $B \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i)$ does not hold.)

We observe that if P and Q are any woods such that $\mathcal{M}(Q) = \mathcal{M}(P)$ and $P \subseteq Q$ both hold, H is any set such that every member of H is a set, and (i,B) is any member of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H)))$, then $\mathbb{G}_{iB}(Q,H)$ is the set whose members are all the members A of $(Q \vdash P)$ such that $(i,B) \in \mathbb{J}_A(P,Q,H)$ holds. For if A is any member of $(Q \vdash P)$, then by definition, $\mathbb{J}_A(P,Q,H)$ is the set of all the ordered pairs (i,B) of a member i of $\mathcal{T}(A,H)$ such that there is no member C of P such that $A \subseteq C$ holds and $i \in \mathcal{T}(C,H)$ holds, and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),A)$. And $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H)))$ is the set of all ordered pairs (i,B) of a member i of $\mathcal{O}(P,H) = \mathcal{O}(Q,H)$, and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i))$.

Let (i, B) be any member of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{J}(P, Q, H)))$, and suppose first that A is any member of $\mathbb{G}_{iB}(Q, H)$. Then $B \subseteq A \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, i)$ holds, hence $B \in \mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{Z}(P, H, i), A)$ holds, and furthermore $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i) \subset A$ holds. And furthermore $i \in \mathcal{T}(A, H)$ holds, for $i \in \mathcal{Z}(P, H, i)$ holds hence $i \in A$ holds, and if there was a member E of H such that $i \in E$ and $E \subseteq A$ both held, then E would be a member of H such that $i \in E$ and $E \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, i)$ both held, which is impossible. And furthermore there is no member C of P such that $A \subseteq C$ and $i \in \mathcal{T}(C, H)$ both hold, for if C is any member of P such that $i \in \mathcal{T}(C, H)$ holds, then $C \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(P, H, i)$ holds, hence $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i) \subset A$ implies $C \subset A$. Hence $(i, B) \in \mathbb{J}_A(P, Q, H)$ holds.

Now let A be any member of $(Q \vdash P)$ such that $(i, B) \in \mathbb{J}_A(P, Q, H)$ holds. Then $i \in \mathcal{T}(A, H)$ holds, hence $A \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, i)$ holds, and B is a member of $\mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{Z}(P, H, i), A)$, hence $B \subseteq A$ holds, hence $A \in \mathbb{G}_{iB}(Q, H)$ holds.

For any ordered quadruple (P, Q, H, ρ) of a wood P, a wood Q such that $\mathcal{M}(Q) = \mathcal{M}(P)$ holds and $P \subseteq Q$ holds, a set H such that every member of H is a set, and a member ρ of $\mathbb{R}^{(Q \vdash P)}$, we define $\mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho)$ to be the member of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H)))}$ such that for each member (i, B) of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{J}(P, Q, H)))$,

$$\mathcal{X}_{iB}(P, Q, H, \rho) \equiv (\mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho))_{iB} \equiv \prod_{A \in \mathbb{G}_{iB}(Q,H)} \rho_A.$$

We observe that if P and Q are any woods such that $\mathcal{M}(Q) = \mathcal{M}(P)$ and $P \subseteq Q$ both hold, F is any member of $\mathbb{K}(P, Q)$, H is any set such that every member of H is a set, x is any member of $\mathbb{F}_d(\mathcal{M}(P))$, where d is an integer ≥ 1, and ρ is the particular member of $\mathbb{R}^{(Q \vdash P)}$ such that $\rho_A = 0$ holds for every member A of $(F \vdash P)$, and $\rho_A = 1$ holds for every member A of $(Q \vdash F)$, or in other words, if $\rho = \mathcal{U}\left(\{0\}^{(F \vdash P)} \cup \{1\}^{(Q \vdash F)}\right)$, then $\mathcal{X}_{iB}(P, Q, H, \rho) = 0$ holds for every member (i, B) of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{J}(P, Q, H)))$ such that $B \in \mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{Z}(P, H, i), \mathcal{Z}(F, H, i))$ holds, and $\mathcal{X}_{iB}(P, Q, H, \rho) = 1$ holds for every member (i, B) of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{J}(P, Q, H)))$ such that $B \in \mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{Z}(F, H, i), \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, i))$ holds, hence the equation $\mu\left(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}\left(P, Q, H, \mathcal{U}\left(\{0\}^{(F \vdash P)} \cup \{1\}^{(Q \vdash F)}\right)\right)\right) = \eta(F, H, x)$ holds.

We observe that if P and Q are any woods such that $\mathcal{M}(Q) = \mathcal{M}(P)$ holds and $P \subseteq Q$ holds, H is any set such that every member of H is a set, x is any member of $\mathbb{F}_d(\mathcal{M}(P))$, where d is an integer ≥ 1, i is any member of $\mathcal{O}(P, H)$, and ρ is any member of $\mathbb{R}^{(Q \vdash P)}$ such that $0 \leq \rho_A \leq 1$ holds for every member A of $(Q \vdash P)$, then $\mu_i(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho))$ is a member of the convex hull, (in $\mathbb{E}_d$), of all the x_A, $A \in (\{\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i)\} \cup \mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{Z}(P, H, i), \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, i)))$. (We note that

$(\{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)\}\cup\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i)))$ is the set of all the members A of Q such that $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)\subseteq A\subseteq\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i)$ holds.) For by definition,

$$\mu_i(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho)) = x_{\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i)} + \sum_{A\in\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i))}\left(\prod_{B\in\mathbb{G}_{iA}(Q,H)}\rho_B\right)\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)}-x_A\right)$$

$$= \left(\prod_{B\in\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i))}\rho_B\right)x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)} + \sum_{A\in\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i))}\left(\prod_{B\in\mathbb{Y}(Q,A,\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i))}\rho_B\right)(1-\rho_A)\,x_A,$$

hence if we define the member u of $\mathbb{R}^{\left(\mathbb{G}_{i\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}(Q,H)\right)} =$
$= \mathbb{R}^{(\{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)\}\cup\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i)))}$ by

$$u_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)} \equiv \left(\prod_{B\in\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i))}\rho_B\right)$$

and by

$$u_A \equiv \left(\prod_{B\in\mathbb{Y}(Q,A,\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i))}\rho_B\right)(1-\rho_A)$$

for all $A\in\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i))$, we have that

$$\mu_i(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho)) = \sum_{A\in\left(\mathbb{G}_{i\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}(Q,H)\right)} u_A x_A$$

holds and that

$$\sum_{A\in\left(\mathbb{G}_{i\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}(Q,H)\right)} u_A = 1$$

holds, and furthermore, since $0\leq\rho_B\leq 1$ holds for all members B of $(Q\vdash P)$, that $u_A\geq 0$ holds for all members A of $\mathbb{G}_{i\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}(Q,H)$.

We note that if V is any partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V)\geq 2$ holds, H is any partition such that if E is any member of H such that E intersects *more* than one member of V, then E has *exactly* two members, σ is any real number such that $0<\sigma\leq\frac{1}{8}$ holds, R is any finite real number >0, d is any integer ≥ 1, x is any member of $\mathbb{F}_d(V)$ such that for every member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$, and for every two *distinct* members B and C of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$ such that there exists a member i of B and a member j of C such that $\{i,j\}$ is a member of H, $|x_B-x_C|>0$ holds, (P,Q) is any member of $\Omega(H,\sigma,R,x)$, and y is any member of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)}$ such that for every member i of $\mathcal{O}(V,H)$, y_i is a member of the convex hull, (in $\mathbb{E}_d$), of all the x_A, $A\in(\{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)\}\cup\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i)))$, then it follows directly from Lemma 14 that if i and j are any two members of $\mathcal{U}(V)$ such that $\{i,j\}$ is a member of H and is *not* a subset of any member of V, then $|y_i - y_j| > 0$ holds. For if i and j are any two members of $\mathcal{U}(V)$ such that $\{i,j\}$ is a member of H and is *not* a subset of any member of V, then $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, \{i,j\}\right)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right) = \left(\bar{P} \vdash V\right)$, and the fact that H is a *partition* implies that $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)$ is the largest member of P that has i as a member but does *not* have j as a member, hence $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i) = \mathcal{K}\left(P, \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, \{i,j\}\right), i\right)$ holds, and $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)$ is the largest member of P that has j as a member but does *not* have i as a member, hence $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j) = \mathcal{K}\left(P, \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, \{i,j\}\right), j\right)$ holds, hence $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)$ are distinct members of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, \{i,j\}\right)\right)$, hence by assumption $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}\right| > 0$ holds, hence by Lemma 14, $|y_i - y_j| > 0$ holds.

If d is an integer ≥ 1 and A is a finite set then an *open subset of* $\mathbb{E}_d^A$ is a subset S of $\mathbb{E}_d^A$ such that for every member x of S there exists a real number $\varepsilon > 0$ such that every member y of $\mathbb{E}_d^A$ such that $|y_i - x_i| \leq \varepsilon$ holds for every member i of A, is a member of S.

For any ordered quadruple (P,Q,H,u) of a wood P, a wood Q such that $\mathcal{M}(Q) = \mathcal{M}(P)$ holds and $P \subseteq Q$ holds, a set H such that every member of H is a set, and a member u of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))}$, we define $\xi(P,Q,H,u)$ to be the map whose domain is $(Q \vdash P)$, and such that for each member A of $(Q \vdash P)$, the equation

$$\xi_A(P,Q,H,u) \equiv (\xi(P,Q,H,u))_A \equiv \sum_{(i,B) \in (\mathbb{I}_A(Q,H) \cap \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P))))} u_{iB}$$

holds.

Lemma 22. Let P and Q be any woods such that $\mathcal{M}(Q) = \mathcal{M}(P)$ holds and $P \subseteq Q$ holds, let H be any partition, let d be any integer ≥ 1, let S be any finite real number > 0, let D be any map such that $\mathbb{B}(Q) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(D)$ holds and $\mathcal{R}(D) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ holds, and let $\mathbb{1}$ be a map such that $(Q \vdash P) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{1})$ holds and such that for each member A of $(Q \vdash P)$, $\mathbb{1}_A = 1$ holds.

Let $\mathcal{J}$ be a map such that $\mathbb{K}(P,Q) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{J})$ holds, and such that for each member F of $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$, $\mathcal{J}_F$ is a map whose domain is a subset of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(P)}$ and whose range is a subset of $\mathbb{R}$.

For each member F of $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$, and for each member y of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{J}_F)$, we define $\mathcal{J}_F(y) \equiv (\mathcal{J}_F)_y$.

Let $\mathcal{J}$ satisfy the requirement that if F and G are any members of $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$, and

y is any member of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(P)}$, such that for every two-member member $\{i,j\}$ of H such that $\{i,j\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(P,H)$ holds, either $|y_i - y_j| \leq S$ holds or $\mathcal{Y}(F,\{i,j\}) = \mathcal{Y}(G,\{i,j\})$ holds, then y is a member of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{J}_F)$ ifif y is a member of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{J}_G)$, and if y *is* a member of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{J}_F)$, then $\mathcal{J}_F(y) = \mathcal{J}_G(y)$ holds.

Let x be any member of $\mathbb{F}_d(\mathcal{M}(P))$ such that $\mathbb{L}(P,A,x) < S$ holds for every member A of $(Q \vdash P)$, and such that there exists an open subset Z of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{O}(P,H)}$ that satisfies the following two requirements:

(i) If y is any member of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)}$, such that for every member i of $\mathcal{O}(P,H)$, y_i is a member of the convex hull, (in $\mathbb{E}_d$), of all the x_A, $A \in (\{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)\} \cup \mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i)))$, then $\downarrow(y,\mathcal{O}(P,H))$ is a member of Z.

(ii) $\mathcal{J}_Q(y)$ and all its derivatives with respect to the y_i, $i \in \mathcal{O}(P,H)$, of degree up to and including $\sum_{A\in\mathbb{B}(Q)}(\max(D_A,0)+1)$, exist and are continuous for all members y of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(P)}$ such that $\downarrow(y,\mathcal{O}(P,H)) \in Z$ holds and $\downarrow(y,(\mathcal{U}(P) \vdash \mathcal{O}(P,H))) = \downarrow(\eta(F,H,x),(\mathcal{U}(P) \vdash \mathcal{O}(P,H))) = x_{\mathcal{C}(P,i)}$ holds.

Let $\mathbb{D}$ be the set whose members are all the members ρ of $\mathbb{R}^{(Q\vdash P)}$ such that $0 \leq \rho_A \leq 1$ holds for every member A of $(Q \vdash P)$.

Then the following equation holds:

$$\sum_{F\in\mathbb{K}(P,Q)} (-1)^{\#(F\vdash P)} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{X}(\mathbb{I}(F,H),D)} \times$$

$$\times \left(\left(\prod_{(i,A)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{I}(F,H)))} \left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(F,A,i)} - x_A\right).\hat{y}_i\right)^{n_{iA}}}{n_{iA}!} \right) \right) \mathcal{J}_F(y) \right)_{y=\eta(F,H,x)} =$$

$$= \sum_{u\in\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P),D)} \; \sum_{m\in\mathbb{A}(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H),(D-\xi(P,Q,H,u)+\mathbf{1}))} \int_{\mathbb{D}} \left(d^{\#(Q\vdash P)}\rho\right) \times$$

$$\times \left(\left(\prod_{A\in(Q\vdash P)} (1-\rho_A)^{(D_A - \xi_A(P,Q,H,u))} \left(D_A - \xi_A(P,Q,H,u) + 1\right) \right) \times \right.$$

$$\times \left(\prod_{((i,B),X)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H))))} \left(\prod_{E\in(\mathbb{G}_{iB}(Q,H)\vdash X)} \rho_E \right)^{m_{iBX}} \right) \times$$

$$\times \left(\left(\prod_{((i,B),X)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H))))} \left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,B,i)} - x_B\right).\hat{y}_i\right)^{m_{iBX}}}{m_{iBX}!} \right) \right) \times \right.$$

$$\times \Bigg(\prod_{(i,A) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))} \left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)} - x_A\right) . \hat{y}_i\right)^{u_{iA}}}{u_{iA}!} \right) \Bigg) \mathcal{J}_Q\left(y\right) \Bigg)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))} \Bigg)$$

Proof. We first note that our assumptions on $\mathcal{J}$ imply that if y is any member of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(P)}$ such that $|y_i - y_j| < S$ holds for every two-member member $\{i,j\}$ of H such that $\{i,j\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}\left(P,H\right)$ and $\mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\{i,j\}\right) \in \left(Q \vdash P\right)$ both hold, then there exists a real number $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every member F of $\mathbb{K}\left(P,Q\right)$, and for every member z of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(P)}$ such that $|y_i - z_i| \leq \varepsilon$ holds for every member i of $\mathcal{O}\left(P,H\right)$, z is a member of $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{J}_F\right)$ ifif z is a member of $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{J}_Q\right)$, and if z *is* a member of $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{J}_Q\right)$, then $\mathcal{J}_F\left(z\right) = \mathcal{J}_Q\left(z\right)$ holds.

For let ε equal half the minimum value taken by $\left(S - |y_i - y_j|\right)$ when $\{i,j\}$ is allowed to be any two-member member of H such that $\{i,j\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}\left(P,H\right)$ and $\mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\{i,j\}\right) \in \left(Q \vdash P\right)$ both hold. Then if z is any member of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(P)}$ such that $|y_i - z_i| \leq \varepsilon$ holds for every member i of $\mathcal{O}\left(P,H\right)$, and $\{i,j\}$ is any two-member member of H such that $\{i,j\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}\left(P,H\right)$ and $\mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\{i,j\}\right) \in \left(Q \vdash P\right)$ both hold, we find by the triangle inequality that

$$|z_i - z_j| \leq |z_i - y_i| + |y_i - y_j| + |y_j - z_j| \leq \varepsilon + \left(S - 2\varepsilon\right) + \varepsilon = S$$

holds.

Now let z be any member of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(P)}$ such that $|z_k - z_m| \leq S$ holds for every two-member member $\{k,m\}$ of H such that $\{k,m\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}\left(P,H\right)$ and $\mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\{k,m\}\right) \in \left(Q \vdash P\right)$ both hold, and let $\{i,j\}$ be any two-member member of H such that $\{i,j\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}\left(P,H\right)$ holds. Then either $\mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\{i,j\}\right) \in \left(Q \vdash P\right)$ holds or $\mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\{i,j\}\right) \in P$ holds or $\mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\{i,j\}\right) \notin Q$ holds.

Suppose first that $\mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\{i,j\}\right) \in \left(Q \vdash P\right)$ holds. Then by the stated condition on z, $|z_i - z_j| \leq S$ holds.

Now suppose that $\mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\{i,j\}\right) \in P$ holds. Then for every member F of $\mathbb{K}\left(P,Q\right)$, $\mathcal{Y}\left(F,\{i,j\}\right) = \mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\{i,j\}\right)$ holds. For $\mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\{i,j\}\right) \in P$ implies $\mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\{i,j\}\right) \in F$ hence, since $\mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\{i,j\}\right)$ is the smallest member *of* Q to contain i and j, it is certainly the smallest member of F to contain i and j. Hence $\mathcal{Y}\left(F,\{i,j\}\right) = \mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\{i,j\}\right)$ holds.

And finally suppose that $\mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\{i,j\}\right) \notin Q$ holds, or in other words, that $\mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\{i,j\}\right) = \emptyset$ holds. This implies that *no* member of Q contains both i and j, hence for every member F of $\mathbb{K}\left(P,Q\right)$, *no* member of F contains both i and j, hence $\mathcal{Y}\left(F,\{i,j\}\right) = \mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\{i,j\}\right) = \emptyset$ holds.

Hence for every member F of $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$, and for every two-member member $\{i,j\}$ of H such that $\{i,j\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(P,H)$ holds, either $|z_i - z_j| \leq S$ holds or $\mathcal{Y}(F,\{i,j\}) = \mathcal{Y}(Q,\{i,j\})$ holds, hence by the assumed properties of $\mathcal{J}$, $\mathcal{J}_F(z)$ is defined ifif $\mathcal{J}_Q(z)$ is defined, and if $\mathcal{J}_Q(z)$ *is* defined, then $\mathcal{J}_F(z) = \mathcal{J}_Q(z)$ holds .

From this it follows immediately that if F is any member of $\mathbb{K}(P,Q)$, and y is any member of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(P)}$ such that $|y_i - y_j| < S$ holds for all two-member members $\{i,j\}$ of H such that $\{i,j\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(P,H)$ and $\mathcal{Y}(Q,\{i,j\}) \in (Q \vdash P)$ both hold, then each derivative of $\mathcal{J}_F$ with respect to the y_i, $i \in \mathcal{O}(P,H)$, exists at y ifif the corresponding derivative of $\mathcal{J}_Q$ exists at y, and if the corresponding derivative of $\mathcal{J}_Q$ does exist at y, then the corresponding derivative of $\mathcal{J}_F$ is equal to it.

We now observe that our assumption that $\mathbb{L}(P,A,x) < S$ holds for every member A of $(Q \vdash P)$, implies that if $\{i,j\}$ is any two-member member of H such that $\{i,j\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(P,H)$ and $\mathcal{Y}(Q,\{i,j\}) \in (Q \vdash P)$ both hold, then $|\eta_i(F,H,x) - \eta_j(F,H,x)| < S$ holds.

For $\{i,j\} \in \mathcal{O}(P,H)$ implies that, by definition, $\eta_i(F,H,x) = x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)}$ holds. Furthermore $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i) \subseteq \mathcal{Y}(Q,\{i,j\})$ holds, since $\mathcal{Y}(Q,\{i,j\})$ is a member of F that contains the member $\{i,j\}$ of H as a subset, and $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$ is by definition the largest member B of F such that $i \in B$ holds and there is *no* member C of H such that $i \in C$ and $C \subseteq B$ both hold.

Furthermore the assumption that $\{i,j\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(P,H)$ holds implies directly that $\mathcal{Y}(Q,\{i,j\})$ is *not* a member of $\mathcal{M}(P)$, hence that $\mathcal{P}(P,\mathcal{Y}(Q,\{i,j\}))$ is a partition of $\mathcal{Y}(Q,\{i,j\})$ such that $\#(\mathcal{P}(P,\mathcal{Y}(Q,\{i,j\}))) \geq 2$ holds.

Furthermore the assumption that H is a *partition* implies that $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$ is *not* a strict subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P,\mathcal{Y}(Q,\{i,j\}))$. For $\mathcal{K}(P,\mathcal{Y}(Q,\{i,j\}),i)$ is a member of Q, hence the fact that $\mathcal{Y}(Q,\{i,j\})$ is by definition the *smallest* member of Q that contains $\{i,j\}$ as a subset, implies that j is not a member of $\mathcal{K}(P,\mathcal{Y}(Q,\{i,j\}),i)$. And the assumption that H is a partition implies that $\{i,j\}$ is the *only* member C of H such that $i \in C$ holds, hence there is *no* member C of H such that $i \in C$ and $C \subseteq \mathcal{K}(P,\mathcal{Y}(Q,\{i,j\}),i)$ both hold, hence the fact that $\mathcal{K}(P,\mathcal{Y}(Q,\{i,j\}),i)$ is a member of F implies that $\mathcal{K}(P,\mathcal{Y}(Q,\{i,j\}),i) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$ holds.

Hence $\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)$ is a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P,\mathcal{Y}(Q,\{i,j\})))$, hence, as shown on page 33, $\eta_i(F,H,x) = x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)}$ is a member of the convex hull of the x_C, $C \in \mathcal{P}(P,\mathcal{Y}(Q,\{i,j\}))$.

And similarly, $\eta_j(F,H,x) = x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,j)}$ is a member of the convex hull of the x_C, $C \in \mathcal{P}(P,\mathcal{Y}(Q,\{i,j\}))$.

Hence by Lemma 3, $\left|\eta_i\left(F,H,x\right)-\eta_j\left(F,H,x\right)\right|\leq\mathbb{L}\left(P,\mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\left\{i,j\right\}\right),x\right)$ holds. But $\mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\left\{i,j\right\}\right)\in\left(Q\vdash P\right)$ holds by assumption, hence the assumption that $\mathbb{L}\left(P,A,x\right)<S$ holds for every member A of $\left(Q\vdash P\right)$, implies that $\mathbb{L}\left(P,\mathcal{Y}\left(Q,\left\{i,j\right\}\right),x\right)<S$ holds, hence that $\left|\eta_i\left(F,H,x\right)-\eta_j\left(F,H,x\right)\right|<S$ holds.

Now for each member F of $\mathbb{K}\left(P,Q\right)$ let U_F be defined by:

$$U_F\equiv\sum_{n\in\mathbb{X}\left(\mathbb{I}\left(F,H\right),D\right)}\left(\left(\prod_{\left(i,A\right)\in\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\mathbb{I}\left(F,H\right)\right)\right)}\left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}\left(F,A,i\right)}-x_A\right).\hat{y}_i\right)^{n_{iA}}}{n_{iA}!}\right)\right)\mathcal{J}_F\left(y\right)\right)_{y=\eta\left(F,H,x\right)}$$

Then it follows immediately from the foregoing, together with our assumptions on $\mathcal{J}$ and our assumptions on x, that for each member F of $\mathbb{K}\left(P,Q\right)$, the following equation holds:

$$U_F=\sum_{n\in\mathbb{X}\left(\mathbb{I}\left(F,H\right),D\right)}\left(\left(\prod_{\left(i,A\right)\in\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\mathbb{I}\left(F,H\right)\right)\right)}\left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}\left(F,A,i\right)}-x_A\right).\hat{y}_i\right)^{n_{iA}}}{n_{iA}!}\right)\right)\mathcal{J}_Q\left(y\right)\right)_{y=\eta\left(F,H,x\right)}$$

Now let F be any member of $\mathbb{K}\left(P,Q\right)$. We use Lemma 16, taking M of Lemma 16 to be the map $\mathbb{I}\left(F,H\right)$, and λ of Lemma 16 to be the map whose domain is $\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\mathbb{I}\left(F,H\right)\right)\right)$, (namely the set of all ordered pairs $\left(i,B\right)$ of a member i of $\mathcal{O}\left(F,H\right)=\mathcal{O}\left(P,H\right)$ and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}\left(F,\mathcal{C}\left(F,i\right),\mathcal{Z}\left(F,H,i\right)\right)$), and such that for each member $\left(i,B\right)$ of $\mathcal{D}\left(\lambda\right)=\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\mathbb{I}\left(F,H\right)\right)\right)$, $\lambda_{\left(i,B\right)}$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs $\left(i,C\right)$ such that $C\in\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{K}\left(F,B,i\right),B\right)$ holds. (We note that this satisfies the requirement that if $\left(i,B\right)$ is a member of $\mathcal{D}\left(\lambda\right)$ and $\left(j,E\right)$ is a member of $\mathcal{D}\left(\lambda\right)$ such that $\left(i,B\right)\neq\left(j,E\right)$ holds, or in other words such that at least one of $i\neq j$ and $B\neq E$ holds, then $\lambda_{\left(i,B\right)}\cap\lambda_{\left(j,E\right)}=\emptyset$ holds.)

Then the corresponding map T, defined in terms of M and λ as specified in Lemma 16, is the map $\downarrow\left(\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right),F\right)$, that is, the restriction of the map $\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right)$ to the domain $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right)\right)\cap F=\mathbb{B}\left(F\right)$. For if A is any member of $\mathcal{D}\left(M\right)$, or in other words, if A is any member of $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{I}\left(F,H\right)\right)=\mathbb{B}\left(F\right)$, then by definition $T_A\equiv\bigcup_{\alpha\in M_A}\lambda_\alpha$, which in the present case becomes $T_A\equiv\bigcup_{\left(i,B\right)\in\mathbb{I}_A\left(F,H\right)}\lambda_{\left(i,B\right)}$. But $\mathbb{I}_A\left(F,H\right)$ is the set of all ordered pairs $\left(i,B\right)$ such that $i\in\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)$ holds and $B\in\mathbb{Y}\left(F,\mathcal{C}\left(F,i\right),A\right)$ holds hence, with $\lambda_{\left(i,B\right)}$ defined as above, T_A is the set of all ordered pairs $\left(i,B\right)$ such that $i\in\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)$ holds and $B\in\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(F,i\right),A\right)$ holds, or in other words such that $B\in\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(Q,i\right),A\right)$ holds, hence $T_A=\mathbb{I}_A\left(Q,H\right)$.

And, as specified in Lemma 16, $\mathcal{D}\left(T\right)$ is equal to $\mathcal{D}\left(M\right)$, hence $T=\downarrow\left(\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right),F\right)$.

Hence Lemma 16 implies directly that the following equation holds:

$$U_F = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),F),D)} \left(\left(\prod_{(i,A)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),F)))} \left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)} - x_A \right) .\hat{y}_i \right)^{m_{iA}}}{m_{iA}!} \right) \right) \mathcal{J}_Q\left(y\right) \right)_{y=\eta(F,H,x)}$$

We next use Lemma 17, with the map V of Lemma 17 taken as the map $\downarrow\left(\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right),F\right)$, the set J of Lemma 17 taken as the set $\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)$, and the set K of Lemma 17 taken as the set $\left(F \vdash P\right)$.

Then the corresponding map W, defined as specified in Lemma 17, is the map $\downarrow\left(\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right),\left(F \vdash P\right)\right) =\downarrow\left(\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right),F\right)$. (This follows directly from the fact that $\downarrow\left(\downarrow\left(\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right),F\right),P\right)$ is equal to $\downarrow\left(\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right),P\right)$.)

Furthermore with V, J, and K taken as above, and u being any member of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(V,J)))}$, which in the present case means that u is any member of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))}$, the map $\xi\left(P,Q,H,u\right)$, defined on pages 92 and 93, satisfies the assumptions made on the map $\zeta\left(u\right)$ in Lemma 17.

Hence Lemma 17 implies directly that the following equation holds:

$$\begin{aligned} U_F = & \sum_{u\in\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P),D)} \; \sum_{v\in\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H),F),(D-\xi(P,Q,H,u)))} \times \\ & \times \left(\left(\prod_{(i,A)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H),F)))} \left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)} - x_A \right) .\hat{y}_i \right)^{v_{iA}}}{v_{iA}!} \right) \right) \times \right. \\ & \left. \times \left(\prod_{(i,A)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))} \left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)} - x_A \right) .\hat{y}_i \right)^{u_{iA}}}{u_{iA}!} \right) \right) \mathcal{J}_Q\left(y\right) \right)_{y=\eta(F,H,x)} \end{aligned}$$

Now, as shown on page 91, $\eta\left(F,H,x\right)$ is equal to $\mu\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\mathcal{U}\left(\{0\}^{(F\vdash P)} \cup \{1\}^{(Q\vdash F)}\right)\right)\right)$, hence the above equation may be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} U_F = & \sum_{u\in\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P),D)} \; \sum_{v\in\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H),F),(D-\xi(P,Q,H,u)))} \times \\ & \times \left(\left(\left(\prod_{(i,A)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H),F)))} \left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)} - x_A \right) .\hat{y}_i \right)^{v_{iA}}}{v_{iA}!} \right) \right) \times \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. \times \left(\prod_{(i,A)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))} \left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)} - x_A \right) .\hat{y}_i \right)^{u_{iA}}}{u_{iA}!} \right) \right) \mathcal{J}_Q\left(y\right) \right)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,r)} \right)_{r=\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\mathcal{U}\left(\{0\}^{(F\vdash P)}\cup\{1\}^{(Q\vdash F)}\right)\right)} \end{aligned}$$

Hence by the chain rule for differentiating a function of a function, and noting that

$$\hat{r}_{iA}\mathcal{J}_Q\left(\mu\left(P,Q,H,x,r\right)\right)=\left(\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)}-x_A\right).\hat{y}_i\right)\mathcal{J}_Q\left(y\right)\right)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,r)}$$

holds, we have

$$\begin{aligned}U_F={}&\sum_{u\in\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P),D)}\ \sum_{v\in\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H),F),(D-\xi(P,Q,H,u)))}\Biggl(\Biggl(\prod_{(i,A)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H),F)))}\left(\frac{\hat{r}_{iA}^{v_{iA}}}{v_{iA}!}\right)\Biggr)\Biggr)\times\\ &\times\Biggl(\Biggl(\prod_{(i,A)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))}\left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)}-x_A\right).\hat{y}_i\right)^{u_{iA}}}{u_{iA}!}\right)\Biggr)\mathcal{J}_Q\left(y\right)\Biggr)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,r)}\Biggr)_{r=\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\mathcal{U}\left(\{0\}^{(F\vdash P)}\cup\{1\}^{(Q\vdash F)}\right)\right)}\end{aligned}$$

Hence by Lemma 19, with V of Lemma 19 taken as $\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right)$, J of Lemma 19 taken as $(F\vdash P)$, and the function $p\left(\rho\right)$ of Lemma 19 taken as $\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)$, and noting that $\downarrow\left(\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right),(F\vdash P)\right)=\downarrow\left(\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right),F\right)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}U_F={}&\sum_{u\in\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P),D)}\left(\left(\prod_{A\in(F\vdash P)}\left(\sum_{n_A=0}^{(D_A-\xi_A(P,Q,H,u))}\frac{\hat{\rho}_A^{n_A}}{n_A!}\right)\right)\right)\times\\ &\times\Biggl(\Biggl(\prod_{(i,A)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))}\left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)}-x_A\right).\hat{y}_i\right)^{u_{iA}}}{u_{iA}!}\right)\Biggr)\mathcal{J}_Q\left(y\right)\Biggr)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))}\Biggr)_{\rho=\mathcal{U}\left(\{0\}^{(F\vdash P)}\cup\{1\}^{(Q\vdash F)}\right)}\end{aligned}$$

We now define, for each member A of $(Q\vdash P)$, the operators ν_{A0} and ν_{A1} by specifying that for any ρ-dependent function $f\left(\rho\right)$, the identities

$$\nu_{A0}f\left(\rho\right)\equiv\left(f\left(\rho\right)\right)_{\rho_A=0}$$

and

$$\nu_{A1}f\left(\rho\right)\equiv\left(f\left(\rho\right)\right)_{\rho_A=1}$$

hold.

The above equation for U_F may then be re-written as

$$U_F=\sum_{u\in\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P),D)}\left(\left(\prod_{A\in(Q\vdash F)}\nu_{A1}\right)\left(\prod_{A\in(F\vdash P)}\left(\nu_{A0}\sum_{n_A=0}^{(D_A-\xi_A(P,Q,H,u))}\frac{\hat{\rho}_A^{n_A}}{n_A!}\right)\right)\times\right.$$

$$\times\Bigg(\Bigg(\Bigg(\prod_{(i,A)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))}\Bigg(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)}-x_A\right).\hat{y}_i\right)^{u_{iA}}}{u_{iA}!}\Bigg)\Bigg)\mathcal{J}_Q\left(y\right)\Bigg)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))}\Bigg)\Bigg)$$

Hence

$$\sum_{F\in\mathbb{K}(P,Q)}\left(-1\right)^{\#(F\vdash P)}U_F=\sum_{u\in\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P),D)}\Bigg(\Bigg(\prod_{A\in(Q\vdash P)}\Bigg(\nu_{A1}-\nu_{A0}\sum_{n_A=0}^{(D_A-\xi_A(P,Q,H,u))}\frac{\hat{\rho}_A^{n_A}}{n_A!}\Bigg)\Bigg)\times$$

$$\times\Bigg(\Bigg(\Bigg(\prod_{(i,A)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))}\Bigg(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)}-x_A\right).\hat{y}_i\right)^{u_{iA}}}{u_{iA}!}\Bigg)\Bigg)\mathcal{J}_Q\left(y\right)\Bigg)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))}\Bigg)\Bigg)$$

Now if g is a map whose arguments include the real variable s, then the Taylor remainder identity for the single variable s, derived by repeated integration by parts, is

$$\left(g\left(s\right)\right)_{s=1}-\left(\sum_{m=0}^{n}\frac{\hat{s}^m g\left(s\right)}{m!}\right)_{s=0}=\frac{1}{n!}\int_0^1\left(ds\right)\left(1-s\right)^n\left(\hat{s}^{n+1}g\left(s\right)\right).$$

A sufficient condition for the validity of this identity is for all derivatives of g of degree up to and including $(n+1)$ to exist and be continuous throughout an open subset of $\mathbb{R}$ that contains the interval $0\leq s\leq 1$.

We use this identity in turn for each of the ρ_A, $A\in(Q\vdash P)$, to obtain:

$$\sum_{F\in\mathbb{K}(P,Q)}\left(-1\right)^{\#(F\vdash P)}U_F=$$

$$=\sum_{u\in\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P),D)}\int_{\mathbb{D}}\left(d^{\#(Q\vdash P)}\rho\right)\Bigg(\Bigg(\prod_{A\in(Q\vdash P)}\Bigg(\frac{\left(1-\rho_A\right)^{(D_A-\xi_A(P,Q,H,u))}\;\hat{\rho}_A^{(D_A-\xi_A(P,Q,H,u)+1)}}{\left(D_A-\xi_A\left(P,Q,H,u\right)\right)!}\Bigg)\Bigg)\times$$

$$\times\Bigg(\Bigg(\Bigg(\prod_{(i,A)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))}\Bigg(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)}-x_A\right).\hat{y}_i\right)^{u_{iA}}}{u_{iA}!}\Bigg)\Bigg)\mathcal{J}_Q\left(y\right)\Bigg)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))}\Bigg)\Bigg)$$

Hence by Lemma 18, with the map V of Lemma 18 taken as the map $\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right)$, and the map C of Lemma 18 taken as the map $\mathbb{G}\left(Q,H\right)$, we have

$$\sum_{F\in\mathbb{K}(P,Q)}\left(-1\right)^{\#(F\vdash P)}U_F=$$

$$=\sum_{u\in\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P),D)}\int_{\mathbb{D}}\left(d^{\#(Q\vdash P)}\rho\right)\Bigg(\Bigg(\prod_{A\in(Q\vdash P)}\Bigg(\left(1-\rho_A\right)^{(D_A-\xi_A(P,Q,H,u))}\left(D_A-\xi_A\left(P,Q,H,u\right)+1\right)\Bigg)\Bigg)\times$$

$$\times \sum_{m\in\mathbb{A}(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H),(D-\xi(P,Q,H,u)+\mathbf{1}))} \left(\left(\prod_{((i,B),X)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H))))} \left(\frac{\left(\left(\left(\prod_{E\in(\mathbb{G}_{iB}(Q,H)\vdash X)} \rho_E\right)\hat{r}_{iB}\right)^{m_{iBX}}\right.}{m_{iBX}!}\right)\right)\right.\times$$

$$\times\left.\left.\left(\left(\left(\prod_{(i,A)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))}\left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)}-x_A\right).\hat{y}_i\right)^{u_{iA}}}{u_{iA}!}\right)\right)\mathcal{J}_Q\left(y\right)\right)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,r)}\right)\right)_{r=\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho)}\right)$$

Finally we again use the chain rule for differentiating a function of a function to express the $\hat{r}$ derivatives in terms of $\hat{y}$ derivatives, and observe that in consequence of our assumptions on $\mathcal{J}$ and on x, each term in the sum over the members m of the finite set $\mathbb{A}\left(\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right),\left(D-\xi\left(P,Q,H,u\right)+\mathbb{1}\right)\right)$ is continuous and bounded for all $\rho\in\mathbb{D}$, so that the sum over the members m of $\mathbb{A}\left(\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right),\left(D-\xi\left(P,Q,H,u\right)+\mathbb{1}\right)\right)$ may be taken outside the ρ-integral, to obtain the stated result.

6 First Convergence Theorem.

We recall from page 32 that for any integer $d\geq 1$ and any ordered pair (V,ω) of a partition V such that V is a finite set, and a set ω of contraction weights for V, we define $\mathbb{U}_d\left(V,\omega\right)$ to be the set whose members are all the members x of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\Xi(V)}$ such that for every member A of $\left(\Xi\left(V\right)\vdash V\right)$, $x_A=\sum_{B\in\mathcal{P}(V,A)}\omega_{AB}x_B$ holds.

We observe that if d is any integer ≥ 1, V is any partition such that $\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)$ is finite and $\#\left(V\right)\geq 2$ holds, ω is any set of contraction weights for V, and A and B are any two distinct members of $\Xi\left(V\right)$ such that $A\cap B$ is empty, then the subset of $\mathbb{U}_d\left(V,\omega\right)$ whose members are all the members x of $\mathbb{U}_d\left(V,\omega\right)$ such that $\left|x_A-x_B\right|=0$ holds is the same as the subset of $\mathbb{U}_d\left(V,\omega\right)$ whose members are all the members x of $\mathbb{U}_d\left(V,\omega\right)$ such that the d independent linear relations $x_{\mu A}-x_{\mu B}=0$, (where μ is the d-vector index), hold among the $d\#\left(V\right)$ independent components of the x_C, $C\in V$, hence the equation $\left|x_A-x_B\right|=0$ defines a $d\left(\#\left(V\right)-1\right)$-dimensional hyperplane in the $d\#\left(V\right)$-dimensional space $\mathbb{U}_d\left(V,\omega\right)$. And for any given real number $\varepsilon>0$ there exists an open subset S_ε of $\mathbb{U}_d\left(V,\omega\right)$ such that this $d\left(\#\left(V\right)-1\right)$-dimensional hyperplane is a subset of S_ε and the $d\#\left(V\right)$-volume of S_ε is $\leq\varepsilon$, for we cut up $\mathbb{U}_d\left(V,\omega\right)$ into a cardinality-$\mathbb{N}$ collection of finite-volume sectors labelled by a bijection from $\mathbb{N}$, then for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$ we choose an open subset T_n of $\mathbb{U}_d\left(V,\omega\right)$ such that the intersection of this $d\left(\#\left(V\right)-1\right)$-

dimensional hyperplane with the n^{th} sector is a subset of T_n and the $d\#(V)$-volume of T_n is $\leq 2^{-(n+1)}\varepsilon$, then define S_ε to be the union of all the T_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

And furthermore, if d, V, and ω are as in the preceding paragraph, then the set whose members are *all* the two-member subsets $\{A, B\}$ of $\Xi(V)$ such that $A \cap B = \emptyset$ holds, is a finite set, hence for any given real number $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an open subset S_ε of $\mathbb{U}_d(V, \omega)$ such that the $d\#(V)$-volume of S_ε is $\leq \varepsilon$ and S_ε contains as a subset the set of all members x of $\mathbb{U}_d(V, \omega)$ such that there *exist* two distinct members A and B of $\Xi(V)$ such that $A \cap B$ is empty and the equation $|x_A - x_B| = 0$ holds.

And we observe furthermore that if d, V, and ω are as in the two preceding paragraphs, b is any member of $\mathbb{E}_d$, h is any member of $\mathcal{U}(V)$, and $\mathbb{W}$ is the subset of $\mathbb{U}_d(V, \omega)$ whose members are all the members x of $\mathbb{U}_d(V, \omega)$ such that $x_{\mathcal{C}(V,h)} = b$ holds, then for any given real number $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an open subset S_ε of the $d(\#(V) - 1)$-dimensional space $\mathbb{W}$ such that the $d(\#(V) - 1)$-volume of S_ε is $\leq \varepsilon$, and S_ε contains as a subset the set of all members x of $\mathbb{W}$ such that there *exist* two distinct members A and B of $\Xi(V)$ such that $A \cap B$ is empty and the equation $|x_A - x_B| = 0$ holds.

Lemma 23. Let n be an integer ≥ 1 and let S be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let f be a map such that $(\mathbb{R}^n \vdash S)$ is a subset of $\mathcal{D}(f)$, $\mathcal{R}(f)$ is a subset of $\mathbb{R}$, and such that if T is any subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that the volume of T is well-defined and finite, and such that for every member x of S and every member y of T, $|x - y| > 0$ holds, then $\int_T d^n x f(x)$ is well-defined and finite and $\int_T d^n x\, |f(x)|$ is well-defined and finite.

Suppose further that there exists a map F such that $(\mathbb{R}^n \vdash S)$ is a subset of $\mathcal{D}(F)$, $\mathcal{R}(F)$ is a subset of $\mathbb{R}$, $F(x) \geq |f(x)|$ holds for all $x \in (\mathbb{R}^n \vdash S)$, and $\int_{(\mathbb{R}^n \vdash S)} d^n x F(x)$ is well-defined and finite as an improper Riemann integral.

Then $\int_{(\mathbb{R}^n \vdash S)} d^n x f(x)$ is well-defined and finite as an improper Riemann integral, and is moreover absolutely convergent.

Proof. Let F be a map such that $(\mathbb{R}^n \vdash S) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(F)$, $\mathcal{R}(F) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $F(x) \geq |f(x)|$ holds for all $x \in (\mathbb{R}^n \vdash S)$, and $\int_{(\mathbb{R}^n \vdash S)} d^n x F(x)$ is well-defined and finite as an improper Riemann integral. This last assumption implies that there exists a map u such that $\mathcal{D}(u) = \mathbb{N}$, and for each member m of $\mathbb{N}$, u_m is a subset of $(\mathbb{R}^n \vdash S)$ such that $\int_{u_m} d^n x F(x)$ is well-defined and finite, and for any members m and p of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $m \leq p$ holds, $u_m \subseteq u_p$ holds, and such that if T is any subset of $(\mathbb{R}^n \vdash S)$ such that $|x - y| > 0$ holds for every member x of S and every member y of T, then there exists a member k of $\mathbb{N}$ such that for all members m of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $m \geq k$ holds,

$T \subseteq u_m$ holds, and such that for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a member k of $\mathbb{N}$ such that for all members l of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $l \geq k$ holds, and all members m of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $m \geq l$ holds, $\left|\left(\int_{u_m} d^n x F(x)\right) - \left(\int_{u_l} d^n x F(x)\right)\right| \leq \varepsilon$ holds, or in other words, $\int_{u_m \vdash u_l} d^n x F(x) \leq \varepsilon$ holds. Let u be such a map. Then $\left|\int_{u_m \vdash u_l} d^n x f(x)\right| \leq \varepsilon$ holds and $\int_{u_m \vdash u_l} d^n x \left|f(x)\right| \leq \varepsilon$ holds, hence the sequences $\int_{u_m} d^n x f(x)$ and $\int_{u_m} d^n x \left|f(x)\right|$ are Cauchy sequences hence convergent.

We note that, as is well known, if an improper Riemann integral $\int_{(\mathbb{R}^n \vdash S)} d^n x f(x)$ is absolutely convergent then its value is independent of the particular choice of the map u used to define it, provided that u has the properties listed in the proof of Lemma 23. For suppose that $\int_{(\mathbb{R}^n \vdash S)} d^n x f(x)$ is absolutely convergent and that u and v are two possibly different such maps. Then for given $\varepsilon > 0$ let k be a member of $\mathbb{N}$ such that for all members l and m of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $m \geq l \geq k$ holds, both $\int_{u_m \vdash u_l} d^n x \left|f(x)\right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ and $\int_{v_m \vdash v_l} d^n x \left|f(x)\right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ hold, and let $m \geq k$ be such that $u_k \subseteq v_m$ and $v_k \subseteq u_m$ both hold. Then for any $p \geq m$ and any $q \geq m$, $(u_p \vdash v_q) \subseteq (u_p \vdash u_k)$ holds, (for any member of u_p that is $\notin v_q$, is not a member of u_k), hence $\int_{u_p \vdash v_q} d^n x \left|f(x)\right| \leq \int_{u_p \vdash u_k} d^n x \left|f(x)\right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ holds, and similarly $(v_q \vdash u_p) \subseteq (v_q \vdash v_k)$ holds hence $\int_{v_q \vdash u_p} d^n x \left|f(x)\right| \leq \int_{v_q \vdash v_k} d^n x \left|f(x)\right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ holds, hence both sequences of integrals converge to the same limit.

Lemma 24. Let V be a finite set such that $\#(V) \geq 2$, let x be a member of $\mathbb{E}_d^V$, and let λ be any member of $\mathbb{R}^V$ such that $\sum_{i \in V} \lambda_i = 1$. Let i be any member of V, and let the member z of $\mathbb{E}_d^V$ be defined by $z_i \equiv \sum_{j \in V} \lambda_j x_j$, and $z_j \equiv (x_j - x_i)$ for $j \neq i$.

Then the Jacobian $\det \frac{\partial z_j}{\partial x_k}$ is equal to 1, and $x_i = z_i - \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_j z_j$.

Proof. We first note that

$$\sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_j z_j = \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_j (x_j - x_i) = \sum_{j \in V} \lambda_j (x_j - x_i) = z_i - x_i.$$

And to calculate the Jacobian we note that the transformation from x to z is equal to the compound of a transformation from x to w, where $w_i \equiv x_i$, and $w_j \equiv (x_j - x_i)$ for $j \neq i$, followed by the transformation from w to z defined by $z_i \equiv w_i + \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_j w_j$, and $z_j \equiv w_j$ for $j \neq i$. And if we write these transformations as matrices with i in the first rows and columns, then the transformation from x to w is lower triangular with 1 in every leading diagonal position, and the transformation from w to z is upper triangular with 1 in every leading diagonal position.

Theorem 1. Let V be a partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, and let H be a partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is $(V \cup H)$-connected and such that if E is any member of H such that E intersects *more* than one member of V, then E has *exactly* two members. (Hence *no* member of H intersects *more* than two members of V.)

Let W be the subset of H whose members are all the members E of H such that E intersects exactly two members of V. (Thus W is a partition such that every member E of W has exactly two members.)

Let d be an integer ≥ 1.

Let Z be the subset of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)}$ whose members are all the members y of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)}$ such that $|y_i - y_j| = 0$ holds for at least one member $\{i, j\}$ of W.

Let θ be a member of $\mathbb{Z}^W$.

For each member A of $(\Xi(V) \vdash V)$, we define

$$D_A \equiv \left(\sum_{\Delta \in (W \cap \mathcal{Q}(A))} \theta_\Delta \right) - d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}(V, A)\right) - 1\right).$$

Let $N \equiv \sum_{A \in (\Xi(V) \vdash V)} (1 + \max(D_A, 0))$.

Let M be a finite real number ≥ 0, and let S and T be finite real numbers such that $0 < S < T$ holds.

Let $\mathcal{J}$ be a map whose domain is $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$, and such that for each member F of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$, $\mathcal{J}_F$ is a map whose domain is $\left(\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)} \vdash Z\right)$ and whose range is a subset of $\mathbb{R}$.

For each member F of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$, and for each member y of $\left(\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)} \vdash Z\right)$, we define $\mathcal{J}_F(y) \equiv (\mathcal{J}_F)_y$.

Let $\mathcal{J}$ satisfy the requirement that if F and G are members of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$, and y is a member of $\left(\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)} \vdash Z\right)$, such that for every member $\{i, j\}$ of W, either $|y_i - y_j| \leq S$ holds or $\mathcal{Y}(F, \{i, j\}) = \mathcal{Y}(G, \{i, j\})$ holds, then $\mathcal{J}_F(y) = \mathcal{J}_G(y)$ holds.

Let $\mathcal{J}$ also satisfy the requirement that for each member F of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$, $\mathcal{J}_F(y)$ and all its derivatives with respect to the y_i, $i \in \mathcal{O}(V, H)$, of degree up to and including N, exist and are continuous for all $y \in \left(\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)} \vdash Z\right)$.

For any ordered pair (i, j) of a map i such that $\mathcal{D}(i)$ is finite and $\mathcal{R}(i) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(V, H)$ holds, and a member j of $\mathcal{O}(V, H)$, let ν_{ij} denote the number of members α of $\mathcal{D}(i)$ such that $i_\alpha = j$ holds.

And let $\mathcal{J}$ also satisfy the requirement that if i is any map such that $\mathcal{D}(i)$ is finite, $\#(\mathcal{D}(i)) \leq N$, and $\mathcal{R}(i) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(V, H)$, and u is any map such that $\mathcal{D}(i) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(u)$, and for each member α of $\mathcal{D}(i)$, u_α is a unit d-vector, then the following inequality holds for all $F \in \mathcal{G}(V, H)$ and for all $y \in \left(\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)} \vdash Z\right)$:

$$\left| \left(\prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{D}(i)} \left(u_\alpha . \hat{y}_{i_\alpha}\right) \right) \mathcal{J}_F(y) \right| \leq M \prod_{\Delta \equiv \{j,k\} \in W} \left|y_j - y_k\right|^{-(\theta_\Delta + \nu_{ij} + \nu_{ik})}.$$

And let $\mathcal{J}$ also satisfy the requirement that if y is any member of $\left(\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)} \vdash Z\right)$ such that $|y_i - y_j| \geq T$ holds for any member $\{i, j\}$ of W, then $\mathcal{J}_F(y) = 0$ holds for all members F of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$.

Let ω be any set of contraction weights for V, let h be any member of $\mathcal{U}(V)$, let $O \equiv \mathcal{C}(V, h)$, let b be any member of $\mathbb{E}_d$, and let $\mathbb{W}$ be the subset of $\mathbb{U}_d(V, \omega)$ whose members are all the members x of $\mathbb{U}_d(V, \omega)$ such that $x_O = b$ holds. Then the following integral is finite and absolutely convergent:

$$\int_{\mathbb{W}} \left(\prod_{A \in (V \vdash \{O\})} d^d x_A \right) \left(\sum_{F \in \mathcal{G}(V,H)} (-1)^{\#(\mathbb{B}(F))} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{X}(\mathbb{I}(F,H),D)} \times \right.$$

$$\left. \times \left(\left(\prod_{(i,A) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{I}(F,H)))} \left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(F,A,i)} - x_A\right) . \hat{y}_i\right)^{n_{iA}}}{n_{iA}!} \right) \right) \mathcal{J}_F(y) \right)_{y = \eta(F,H,x)} \right)$$

Proof. We choose a real number σ such that $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{3}{25}$ holds, and we define the real number λ by $\lambda \equiv \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - 8\sigma}\right)$, so that $0 < \lambda \leq \frac{1}{5}$ holds.

We note that λ and σ satisfy the equation $\lambda = \frac{\sigma}{1 - 2\lambda}$, and that $0 < \sigma < \lambda$ holds.

And we choose a real number R such that $0 < R \leq (1 - 2\lambda) S$ holds.

We recall from page 63 that for any member F of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$, and any member x of $\mathbb{U}_d(V, \omega)$, the following identity holds:

$$\sum_{(P,Q) \in \mathcal{N}(V,H)} \mathcal{E}(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x)\, \mathcal{S}(P, F)\, \mathcal{S}(F, Q) = 1$$

Inserting this identity into the integrand of the above integral, and noting that $\mathcal{S}(P, F)\, \mathcal{S}(F, Q)$ is 0 unless $F \in \mathbb{K}(P, Q)$ holds we find that the above integral is equal to

$$\int_{\mathbb{W}} \left(\prod_{A \in (V \vdash \{O\})} d^d x_A \right) \left(\sum_{(P,Q) \in \mathcal{N}(V,H)} \mathcal{E}(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x) \sum_{F \in \mathbb{K}(P,Q)} (-1)^{\#(\mathbb{B}(F))} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{X}(\mathbb{I}(F,H),D)} \times \right.$$

$$\times \Bigg(\Bigg(\prod_{(i,A)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{I}(F,H)))} \Bigg(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(F,A,i)} - x_A\right).\hat{y}_i\right)^{n_{iA}}}{n_{iA}!} \Bigg) \Bigg) \mathcal{J}_F\left(y\right) \Bigg)_{y=\eta(F,H,x)} \Bigg)$$

We shall prove that for each member (P,Q) of $\mathcal{N}\left(V,H\right)$, the integral over $\mathbb{W}$ of the term associated with (P,Q) in the integrand of this integral, is finite and absolutely convergent.

We first use Lemma 22 to conclude that the term associated with (P,Q) in the integrand of the above integral is equal to

$$(-1)^{\#(\mathbb{B}(P))}\,\mathcal{E}\left(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x\right) \times$$

$$\times \sum_{u\in\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P),D)} \ \sum_{m\in\mathbb{A}(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H),(D-\xi(P,Q,H,u)+\mathbf{1}))} \int_{\mathbb{D}} \left(d^{\#(Q\vdash P)}\rho\right) \times$$

$$\times \Bigg(\Bigg(\prod_{A\in(Q\vdash P)} \left(1-\rho_A\right)^{(D_A-\xi_A(P,Q,H,u))} \left(D_A - \xi_A\left(P,Q,H,u\right)+1\right) \Bigg) \times$$

$$\times \Bigg(\prod_{((i,B),X)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H))))} \Bigg(\prod_{E\in(\mathbb{G}_{iB}(Q,H)\vdash X)} \rho_E \Bigg)^{m_{iBX}} \Bigg) \times$$

$$\times \Bigg(\Bigg(\prod_{((i,B),X)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H))))} \Bigg(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,B,i)} - x_B\right).\hat{y}_i\right)^{m_{iBX}}}{m_{iBX}!} \Bigg) \Bigg) \times$$

$$\times \Bigg(\prod_{(i,A)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))} \Bigg(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)} - x_A\right).\hat{y}_i\right)^{u_{iA}}}{u_{iA}!} \Bigg) \Bigg) \mathcal{J}_Q\left(y\right) \Bigg)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))} \Bigg)$$

where $\mathbb{1}$ is a map such that $(Q \vdash P) \subseteq \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{1}\right)$ holds and such that for each member A of $(Q \vdash P)$, $\mathbb{1}_A = 1$ holds, and $\mathbb{D}$ is the set of all members ρ of $\mathbb{R}^{(Q\vdash P)}$ such that $0 \leq \rho_A \leq 1$ holds for every member A of $(Q \vdash P)$.

We shall prove, for each ordered pair (u,m) of a member u of $\mathbb{X}\left(\downarrow\left(\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right),P\right),D\right)$ and a member m of $\mathbb{A}\left(\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right),\left(D-\xi\left(P,Q,H,u\right)+\mathbb{1}\right)\right)$, that the integral over $\mathbb{W}$ of the term in the above formula associated with u and m is finite and absolutely convergent.

Let $\tilde{Z}$ denote the subset of $\mathbb{W}$ whose members are all the members x of $\mathbb{W}$ such that $|x_A - x_B| = 0$ holds for at least one member $\{A,B\}$ of $\mathcal{Q}\left(\Xi\left(V\right)\right)$ such that $A\cap B = \emptyset$. Now if ε is any given real number > 0, then as observed on page 101, there exists an open subset K of $\mathbb{W}$ such that $\tilde{Z} \subseteq K$ holds, and the $d\left(\#\left(V\right)-1\right)$-volume of K is $\leq \varepsilon$.

And our assumptions on $\mathcal{J}$ guarantee that the integral over $(\mathbb{W} \vdash K)$ is finite, hence by Lemma 23, it is sufficient to prove, for some $F(x)$ such that for all $x \in \left(\mathbb{W} \vdash \tilde{Z}\right)$, $F(x)$ is greater than or equal to the absolute value of the term under consideration, that the integral over $\mathbb{W}$ of $F(x)$ converges.

For each ordered pair (y, i) of a member y of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)}$ and a member i of $\mathcal{O}(V, H)$, we define $a(y, i)$ to be equal to $|y_i - y_j|$ if the partition W contains the member $\{i, j\}$, and to be equal to 1 if i is not a member of $\mathcal{U}(W)$.

Let u be any member of $\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q, H), P), D)$ and m be any member of $\mathbb{A}(\mathbb{J}(P, Q, H), (D - \xi(P, Q, H, u) + \mathbb{1}))$. Then by the assumed properties of $\mathcal{J}$, the following inequality holds:

$$\Bigg|\Bigg(\Bigg(\Bigg(\prod_{((i,B),X)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H))))}\left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,B,i)} - x_B\right).\hat{y}_i\right)^{m_{iBX}}}{m_{iBX}!}\right)\Bigg)\Bigg) \times$$

$$\times\Bigg(\prod_{(i,A)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))}\left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)} - x_A\right).\hat{y}_i\right)^{u_{iA}}}{u_{iA}!}\right)\Bigg)\mathcal{J}_Q(y)\Bigg)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))}\Bigg)\Bigg| \leq$$

$$\leq M\Bigg(\Bigg(\prod_{((i,B),X)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H))))}\left(\frac{\left|x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,B,i)} - x_B\right|}{a(y,i)}\right)^{m_{iBX}}\Bigg) \times$$

$$\times\Bigg(\prod_{(i,A)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))}\left(\frac{\left|x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)} - x_A\right|}{a(y,i)}\right)^{u_{iA}}\Bigg) \times$$

$$\times\Bigg(\prod_{\Delta\equiv\{j,k\}\in W}|y_j - y_k|^{-\theta_\Delta}\Bigg)\Bigg(\prod_{\Delta\equiv\{j,k\}\in W}\mathbb{S}(T - |y_j - y_k|)\Bigg)\Bigg)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))}$$

For any ordered pair (x, i) of a member x of $\mathbb{U}_d(V, \omega)$ and a member i of $\mathcal{O}(V, H)$, we define $b(x, i)$ to be equal to $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}\right|$ if i is a member of the member $\{i, j\}$ of the partition W, and to be equal to 1 if i is not a member of any member of W.

Now if $\{i, j\} \in W$ then by page 91 and Lemma 14 we have, for any finite real number α, that

$$|\mu_i(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho)) - \mu_j(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho))|^{-\alpha} \leq$$

$$\leq \left(\frac{1}{1 - 2\lambda}\right)^{|\alpha|}\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}\right|^{-\alpha}$$

holds for all $\rho \in \mathbb{D}$ and for all x such that $\mathcal{E}(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x) \neq 0$, hence for all $\rho \in \mathbb{D}$ and for all x such that $\mathcal{E}(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x) \neq 0$, the above expression is bounded above by

$$M \left(\prod_{((i,B),X) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H))))} \left(\frac{\left| x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,B,i)} - x_B \right|}{(1-2\lambda)\, b(x,i)} \right)^{m_{iBX}} \right) \times$$

$$\times \left(\prod_{(i,A) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))} \left(\frac{\left| x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)} - x_A \right|}{(1-2\lambda)\, b(x,i)} \right)^{u_{iA}} \right) \left(\prod_{\Delta \equiv \{j,k\} \in W} \left(\frac{1}{1-2\lambda} \right)^{|\theta_\Delta|} \right) \times$$

$$\times \left(\prod_{\Delta \equiv \{j,k\} \in W} \left| x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,k)} \right|^{-\theta_\Delta} \right) \left(\prod_{\Delta \equiv \{j,k\} \in W} \mathbb{S}\left(T - (1-2\lambda) \left| x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,k)} \right| \right) \right)$$

The absolute value of the integrand has now been bounded by the product of a factor that depends on ρ but not on x, and a factor that depends on x but not on ρ, and furthermore the ρ-dependent factor is the product of finite powers, all ≥ 0, of $(1 - \rho_A)$ and ρ_A, where A is a member of $(Q \vdash P)$, and the ρ integration domain is $0 \leq \rho_A \leq 1$ for all $A \in (Q \vdash P)$, hence the ρ-integral is finite and absolutely convergent.

Now for any member A of $(\Xi(V) \vdash V)$, the inequality $\left| x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)} - x_A \right| \leq \mathbb{L}(P, A, x)$ holds. Hence it is now sufficient to prove that if u is any member of $\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H), P), D)$ and m is any member of $\mathbb{A}(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H), (D - \xi(P,Q,H,u) + \mathbb{1}))$, then the integral over $\mathbb{W}$ of the quantity I_{um}, defined as follows, is finite:

$$I_{um} \equiv \mathcal{E}(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x) \left(\prod_{((i,A),X) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H))))} \left(\frac{\mathbb{L}(P,A,x)}{b(x,i)} \right)^{m_{iAX}} \right) \times$$

$$\times \left(\prod_{(i,A) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))} \left(\frac{\mathbb{L}(P,A,x)}{b(x,i)} \right)^{u_{iA}} \right) \Theta \;\, \Phi$$

where we also define

$$\Theta \equiv \left(\prod_{\Delta \equiv \{j,k\} \in W} \left| x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,k)} \right|^{-\theta_\Delta} \right)$$

and

$$\Phi \equiv \left(\prod_{\Delta \equiv \{j,k\} \in W} \mathbb{S}\left(T - (1-2\lambda) \left| x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,k)} \right| \right) \right).$$

Let u be any member of $\mathbb{X}\left(\downarrow\left(\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right),P\right),D\right)$, m be any member of $\mathbb{A}\left(\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right),\left(D-\xi\left(P,Q,H,u\right)+\mathbb{1}\right)\right)$, and G be the set whose members are all the maps g such that $\mathcal{D}\left(g\right)=\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right)$, and for each member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right)$, g_A is a member of $\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$.

For any ordered triple (x,g,A) of a member x of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\Xi(V)}$, a member g of G, and a member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right)$, we define $c\left(x,g,A\right)\equiv\left|x_J-x_K\right|$, where J and K are the two members of g_A, or in other words, $g_A=\{J,K\}$.

And for any member g of G, we define

$$U_g\equiv\mathcal{E}\left(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x\right)\left(\prod_{((i,B),X)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H))))}\left(\frac{c\left(x,g,B\right)}{b\left(x,i\right)}\right)^{m_{iBX}}\right)\times$$

$$\times\left(\prod_{(i,B)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))}\left(\frac{c\left(x,g,B\right)}{b\left(x,i\right)}\right)^{u_{iB}}\right)\Theta\ \Phi$$

Now for any member x of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\Xi(V)}$ and for any member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right)$, $\mathbb{L}\left(P,A,x\right)$ is by definition equal to $\max_{\Delta\equiv\{J,K\}\in\mathcal{Q}(P,A)}\left|x_J-x_K\right|$, hence if x is any member of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\Xi(V)}$ then the following inequality holds:

$$I_{um}\leq\sum_{g\in G}U_g$$

(For every term in the right-hand side is ≥ 0, and there is always at least one term in the right-hand side that is equal to the left-hand side.)

We shall prove that if g is any member of the finite set G, then the integral of U_g over $\mathbb{W}$ is finite.

Let g be any member of G. We first observe that, apart from the factors $\mathcal{E}\left(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x\right)$ and Φ, U_g is a product of factors each of which has the form $\left|x_J-x_K\right|^\alpha$, where α is a finite real number, and J and K are members of P such that the following two conditions hold:

(i) $J\neq K$

(ii) If A is any member of P, then $J\subset A$ holds ifif $K\subset A$ holds.

For $\left|x_J-x_K\right|$ is either $c\left(x,g,B\right)$ for some member B of $\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right)$, which means that $\{J,K\}\in\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,B\right)\right)$ holds, or else it is $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}-x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}\right|$ for some member $\{i,j\}$ of W.

In the first case, $J \neq K$ follows directly from $\{J, K\} \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P, B))$. Let A be any member of P. Then if $B \subseteq A$ holds, $J \subset A$ and $K \subset A$ both hold. Now suppose that $B \subseteq A$ does *not* hold. Then since both A and B are members of the wood Q, either $A \subset B$ holds or $A \cap B = \emptyset$ holds. And if $A \subset B$ holds, the fact that J is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, B)$ implies that $J \subset A$ cannot hold, and the fact that K is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, B)$ implies that $K \subset A$ cannot hold. And if $A \cap B = \emptyset$ holds, then $J \cap A = \emptyset$ holds and $K \cap A = \emptyset$ holds, hence since neither J nor K is empty, neither $J \subset A$ nor $K \subset A$ can hold.

And in the second case, i is a member of $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i)$ and j is a member of $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, j)$, but $\{i, j\}$ is not a subset of $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i)$, hence $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i)$ is not equal to $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, j)$. Now let A be any member of P. Then if $\{i, j\} \subseteq A$ holds, $(A \vdash \mathcal{Z}(P, H, i))$ has the member j hence is nonempty, and $(A \cap \mathcal{Z}(P, H, i))$ has the member i hence is nonempty, hence $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i) \subset A$ holds since $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i)$ and A do not overlap, and $(A \vdash \mathcal{Z}(P, H, j))$ has the member i hence is nonempty, and $(A \cap \mathcal{Z}(P, H, j))$ has the member j hence is nonempty, hence $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, j) \subset A$ holds since $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, j)$ and A do not overlap. Now suppose that $\{i, j\}$ is *not* a subset of A. Then at least one of i and j is not a member of A. Suppose first that i is *not* a member of A, and j *is* a member of A. Then $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i) \subset A$ does not hold. And by definition, $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, j)$ is the largest member of P to have j as a member, but not to have as a subset any member of H that has j as a member. But H is a partition, hence $\{i, j\}$ is the only member of H to have j as a member, hence $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, j)$ is the largest member of P to have j as a member but not have i as a member, hence $A \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(P, H, j)$ holds, hence $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, j) \subset A$ does not hold. And if i *is* a member of A, and j is *not* a member of A, an analogous argument shows again that neither $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i) \subset A$ holds nor $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, j) \subset A$ holds. And finally, if neither i nor j is a member of A, then neither $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i) \subset A$ nor $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, j) \subset A$ can hold.

We next note that (i) and (ii) imply directly that $J \cap K = \emptyset$ holds. For taking A as J in (ii) shows that $K \subset J$ does not hold, and taking A as K in (ii) shows that $J \subset K$ does not hold, hence since J and K do not overlap, and J is not equal to K, $J \cap K = \emptyset$ must hold.

We now observe that (i) and (ii) imply that J and K are distinct members of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, J \cup K\right)\right)$. For $J \neq K$ and J and K are nonempty, hence $J \subset \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, J \cup K\right)$ and $K \subset \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, J \cup K\right)$ both hold. Furthermore, there is no member C of P such that $J \subset C \subset \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, J \cup K\right)$ holds, for if there was such a member C of P, then

(ii) and $J \subset C$ would imply that $K \subset C$, hence $(J \cup K) \subseteq C$, which contradicts $C \subset \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, J \cup K\right)$ since by definition $\mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, J \cup K\right)$ is the *smallest* member of $\bar{P}$ to have $(J \cup K)$ as a subset. Hence $J \in \mathcal{P}\left(P, \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, J \cup K\right)\right)$ holds. And by an analogous argument, $K \in \mathcal{P}\left(P, \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, J \cup K\right)\right)$ holds.

Hence $\{J, K\}$ is a member of $\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, \mathcal{Y}\left(\bar{P}, J \cup K\right)\right)\right)$.

We now define α to be the map whose domain is $\bigcup_{A \in \mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)} \mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right)$, and such that for each member $\{J, K\}$ of $\mathcal{D}\left(\alpha\right)$, $\alpha_{\{J,K\}}$ is equal to the negative of the total power of $|x_J - x_K|$ in the expression

$$\left(\prod_{((i,B),X) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H))))} \left(\frac{c\left(x, g, B\right)}{b\left(x, i\right)}\right)^{m_{iBX}}\right)\left(\prod_{(i,B) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))} \left(\frac{c\left(x, g, B\right)}{b\left(x, i\right)}\right)^{u_{iB}}\right)\Theta.$$

Then for each member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$, α is a set of powers for A, and for each member x of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\Xi(V)}$, the following equation holds:

$$U_g = \mathcal{E}\left(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x\right)\left(\prod_{A \in \mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)} \Psi\left(\downarrow\left(x, \mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right), \alpha\right)\right)\Phi$$

Now let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right)$, and let $\{j, k\}$ be any member of W. Then $\left\{\mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, j\right), \mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, k\right)\right\}$ is a member of $\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right)$ ifif $\{j, k\} \subseteq A$ holds and $\{j, k\}$ is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$. For suppose first that $\left\{\mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, j\right), \mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, k\right)\right\}$ is a member of $\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right)$. Then $\{j, k\} \subseteq A$ certainly holds, and furthermore k is not a member of $\mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, j\right)$ and j is not a member of $\mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, k\right)$, hence $\{j, k\}$ is not a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$. Now suppose that $\{j, k\} \subseteq A$ holds and $\{j, k\}$ is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$. Then $\left(A \cap \mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, j\right)\right)$ has the member j hence is nonempty, and $\left(A \vdash \mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, j\right)\right)$ has the member k hence is nonempty, hence $\mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, j\right) \subset A$ holds since $\mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, j\right)$ and A do not overlap. And H is a partition hence $\{j, k\}$ is the only member of H to have j as a member, hence the fact that $\{j, k\}$ is not a subset of $\mathcal{K}\left(P, A, j\right)$ implies that $\mathcal{K}\left(P, A, j\right) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, j\right)$ holds. But $\mathcal{K}\left(P, A, j\right) \subset \mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, j\right)$ cannot hold since $\mathcal{K}\left(P, A, j\right)$ is a member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$, hence $\mathcal{K}\left(P, A, j\right) = \mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, j\right)$ holds hence $\mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, j\right)$ is a member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$. And by an analogous argument, $\mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, k\right)$ is a member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$.

It follows immediately from this, together with the definition of α, that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right)$, then the contribution to $\Gamma\left(\alpha, \mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right)$ from Θ is equal to

$$\left(\sum_{\Delta \in W \cap \mathcal{Q}(A)} \theta_\Delta\right) - \sum_{C \in (\mathcal{P}(P,A) \vdash V)} \left(\sum_{\Delta \in W \cap \mathcal{Q}(C)} \theta_\Delta\right),$$

where we noted that there is no need to include members C of $(\mathcal{P}(P,A) \cap V)$ in the outer summation in the second term, since by assumption no member of W is a subset of any member of V, hence $W \cap \mathcal{Q}(C)$ is empty for every member C of V.

Now for any member A of $(\Xi(V) \vdash V)$, D_A was defined on page 103 by

$$D_A \equiv \left(\sum_{\Delta \in W \cap \mathcal{Q}(A)} \theta_\Delta \right) - d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}(V,A)\right) - 1\right),$$

hence if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(Q)$, then the contribution to $\Gamma(\alpha, \mathcal{P}(P,A))$ from Θ is equal to

$$\left(D_A + d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}(V,A)\right) - 1\right)\right) - \sum_{C \in (\mathcal{P}(P,A) \vdash V)} \left(D_C + d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}(V,C)\right) - 1\right)\right).$$

Now

$$\#\left(\mathcal{P}(V,A)\right) = \left(\sum_{C \in (\mathcal{P}(P,A) \vdash V)} \#\left(\mathcal{P}(V,C)\right) \right) + \#\left(\mathcal{P}(P,A) \cap V\right)$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}(V,A)\right) - 1\right) - \left(\sum_{C \in (\mathcal{P}(P,A) \vdash V)} d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}(V,C)\right) - 1\right) \right) = \\ = d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}(P,A) \cap V\right) - 1 + \#\left(\mathcal{P}(P,A) \vdash V\right)\right) \\ = d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\right) - 1\right), \end{aligned}$$

hence the contribution to $\Gamma(\alpha, \mathcal{P}(P,A))$ from Θ is equal to

$$d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\right) - 1\right) + D_A - \left(\sum_{C \in (\mathcal{P}(P,A) \vdash V)} D_C \right).$$

We now make the following observations:

1) Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}(Q)$ and B be any member of $\mathbb{B}(Q)$ such that $B \subseteq A$ holds and B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$. Then $\mathcal{P}(P,B) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(P,A)$ holds. For let J be any member of $\mathcal{P}(P,B)$. Then $J \subset B$ holds, and there is no member C of P such that $J \subset C \subset B$ holds. Hence $J \subset A$ holds. Now suppose that E is a member of P such that $J \subset E \subset A$ holds. Then $E \cap B$ has the nonempty subset J hence is nonempty, hence either $E \subset B$ holds or $B \subseteq E$ holds, since E does not overlap B. But $E \subset B$ cannot hold, since $J \subset E$ holds and J is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, B)$. Now let X be the set whose members are all the members Y of P such that $E \subseteq Y$ and $Y \subset A$ both hold. Then X is a finite set such that if Y and Z are any members of X, then exactly one of $Y \subset Z$, $Y = Z$, and $Z \subset Y$ holds, and furthermore E is a member of X hence X is nonempty, hence there is a unique member F of X such that $Y \subseteq F$ holds for every member Y of X. Then F is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ and $E \subseteq F$ holds, hence the assumption that B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ implies that $B \subseteq E$ cannot hold. Hence there is *no* member E of P such that $J \subset E \subset A$ holds, hence J is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$.

2) Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}(Q)$ and let B be any member of $\mathbb{B}(Q)$ such that $B \subseteq A$ holds and B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$. Then it follows directly from observation 1) above that $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P, B)) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$ holds.

3) Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}(Q)$ and $\{i, j\}$ be any member of W such that $\{\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i), \mathcal{Z}(P, H, j)\}$ is a member of $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$. Then $\{i, j\} \subseteq A$ holds, and $\{i, j\}$ is *not* a subset of $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$. For $i \in \mathcal{Z}(P, H, i)$ holds and $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i) \subset A$ holds hence $i \in A$ holds, and $j \in \mathcal{Z}(P, H, j)$ holds and $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, j) \subset A$ holds hence $j \in A$ holds. And by assumption $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i)$ is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, hence $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i)$ is the unique member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ to have i as a member, hence $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i) = \mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$. But $\{i, j\}$ is a member of W hence a member of H, hence $\{i, j\}$ is *not* a subset of $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i)$, hence $\{i, j\}$ is not a subset of $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$.

4) By page 77 and page 90, $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(\mathbb{J}(P, Q, H))))$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs $((i, B), X)$ of a member (i, B) of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{J}(P, Q, H)))$ and a nonempty subset X of $\mathbb{G}_{iB}(Q, H)$. And by Lemma 21, $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{J}(P, Q, H)))$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (i, B) of a member i of $\mathcal{O}(Q, H) = \mathcal{O}(V, H)$ and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{Z}(P, H, i), \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, i))$.

5) Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}(Q)$ and $((i, B), X)$ be any member of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(\mathbb{J}(P, Q, H))))$ such that $i \in \mathcal{U}(W)$ holds and $\mathcal{C}(W, i) \subseteq A$ holds and $\mathcal{C}(W, i)$ is *not* a subset of $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$. Then $B \subseteq A$ holds and B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$. For by observation 4) above B is a member of $\mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{Z}(P, H, i), \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, i))$. Now $\mathcal{C}(W, i) \subseteq A$ implies $i \in A$ and $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i) \subset B$ implies $i \in B$, hence $A \cap B$ is nonempty hence either $B \subseteq A$ holds or $A \subset B$ holds since both B and A are members of Q hence do not overlap. But $B \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, i)$ holds hence $\mathcal{C}(W, i)$ is *not* a subset of

B hence $A \subset B$ does not hold hence $B \subseteq A$ holds. Now i is a member of $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$, W is a subset of H, H is a partition, and by assumption $\mathcal{C}(W, i)$ is *not* a subset of $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$, hence i is a member of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{K}(P, A, i), H)$, hence $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$ is a subset of $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i)$ since by definition $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i)$ is the *largest* member C of P such that $i \in \mathcal{T}(C, H)$ holds. But $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i) \subset B$ holds hence $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i) \subset B$ holds, hence B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, for if B was a subset of a member E of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, then $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i) \subset E$ would hold, which is impossible since $\mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$ is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ and $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ is a partition.

6) Let $((i, B), X)$ be any member of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(\mathbb{J}(P, Q, H))))$. Then the contributions of the factor $\left(\frac{c(x,g,B)}{b(x,i)}\right)^{m_{iBX}}$ to the map α are as follows:

The numerator contributes $(-m_{iBX})$ to $\alpha_{\{J,K\}}$, where J and K are the two members of the member g_B of $\mathcal{P}(P, B)$, and makes no contribution to α_Δ for any member Δ of $\mathcal{D}(\alpha)$ other than the member $g_B = \{J, K\}$.

And if $i \in \mathcal{U}(W)$ holds, then $b(x, i)$ is equal to $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}\right|$, where j is the other member of $\mathcal{C}(W, i)$, (or in other words, where $\mathcal{C}(W, i) = \{i, j\}$), and the denominator makes the contribution $(+m_{iBX})$ to $\alpha_{\{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)\}}$, and no contribution to α_Δ for any member Δ of $\mathcal{D}(\alpha)$ other than the member $\{\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i), \mathcal{Z}(P, H, j)\}$.

And if i is *not* a member of $\mathcal{U}(W)$, then $b(x, i)$ is equal to 1, and the denominator makes no contribution to α_Δ for any member Δ of $\mathcal{D}(\alpha)$.

7) Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}(Q)$ and $((i, B), X)$ be any member of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(\mathbb{J}(P, Q, H))))$. Then the contribution of the factor $\left(\frac{c(x,g,B)}{b(x,i)}\right)^{m_{iBX}}$ to $\Gamma(\alpha, \mathcal{P}(P, A))$ is ≤ 0. For m_{iBX} is ≥ 0 hence by observation 6) above the contribution of the numerator is always ≤ 0. And also by observation 6), the denominator makes no contribution to the map α unless $i \in \mathcal{U}(W)$ holds, and if $i \in \mathcal{U}(W)$ does hold then it contributes $+m_{iBX}$ to $\alpha_{\{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)\}}$, where $\mathcal{C}(W, i) = \{i, j\}$, and nothing else. Now suppose the denominator does contribute. Then $\{\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i), \mathcal{Z}(P, H, j)\}$ is a member of $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$, hence by observation 3) above, $\{i, j\} \subseteq A$ holds and $\{i, j\} \subseteq \mathcal{K}(P, A, i)$ does *not* hold, hence by observation 5) above, $B \subseteq A$ holds and B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, hence by observation 2) above, $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P, B)) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$ holds hence the member g_B of $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P, B))$ is a member of $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$, hence by observation 6) above the numerator contributes $-m_{iBX}$ to $\Gamma(\alpha, \mathcal{P}(P, A))$, hence the total contribution of the factor $\left(\frac{c(x,g,B)}{b(x,i)}\right)^{m_{iBX}}$ to $\Gamma(\alpha, \mathcal{P}(P, A))$ is ≤ 0.

8) Let A be any member of $(Q \vdash P)$ and $((i, B), X)$ be any member of $\psi_A(\mathbb{J}(P, Q, H))$.

Then the factor $\left(\frac{c(x,g,B)}{b(x,i)}\right)^{m_{iBX}}$ contributes $-m_{iBX}$ to $\Gamma\left(\alpha,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$. For by page 77 $\psi_A\left(\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right)\right)$ is the set of all ordered pairs $\left(\left(i,B\right),X\right)$ such that $\left(i,B\right)\in\mathbb{J}_A\left(P,Q,H\right)$ holds and X is a subset of $\mathbb{G}_{iB}\left(Q,H\right)$ such that $A\in X$ holds, and by page 88, $\mathbb{J}_A\left(P,Q,H\right)$ is the set of all ordered pairs $\left(i,B\right)$ of a member i of $\left(\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)\vdash\mathcal{T}\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(P,A\right),H\right)\right)$ and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right),A\right)$, and by page 89, $\mathbb{G}_{iB}\left(Q,H\right)$ is the set of all members C of Q such that $B\subseteq C$ and $C\subseteq\mathcal{Z}\left(Q,H,i\right)$ both hold.

Now $B\in\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right),A\right)$ implies that $B\subseteq A$ holds and B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)$, hence the member g_B of $\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,B\right)\right)$ is a member of $\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$ hence by observations 2) and 6) above the numerator contributes $-m_{iBX}$ to $\Gamma\left(\alpha,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$. And $i\in\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)$ implies that *no* member of W that contains i as a member is a subset of A, hence if i *is* a member of $\mathcal{U}\left(W\right)$, and $\mathcal{C}\left(W,i\right)=\left\{i,j\right\}$, then by observation 3) above $\left\{\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,i\right),\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,j\right)\right\}$ is *not* a subset of $\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$, hence the denominator does *not* contribute to $\Gamma\left(\alpha,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$, and if i is *not* a member of $\mathcal{U}\left(W\right)$, then $b\left(x,i\right)=1$ hence the denominator certainly does not contribute to $\Gamma\left(\alpha,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$.

9) It follows directly from observation 7) above that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)$, then the total contribution to $\Gamma\left(\alpha,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$ from the factor
$\left(\prod_{\left(\left(i,B\right),X\right)\in\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\psi\left(\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right)\right)\right)\right)}\left(\frac{c\left(x,g,B\right)}{b\left(x,i\right)}\right)^{m_{iBX}}\right)$ is ≤ 0.

10) If A is any member of $\left(Q\vdash P\right)$, then the total contribution to $\Gamma\left(\alpha,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$ from the factor $\left(\prod_{\left(\left(i,B\right),X\right)\in\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\psi\left(\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right)\right)\right)\right)}\left(\frac{c\left(x,g,B\right)}{b\left(x,i\right)}\right)^{m_{iBX}}\right)$ is
$\leq-\left(D_A-\xi_A\left(P,Q,H,u\right)+1\right)$. For by observation 7) above the contribution of every individual factor in this expression is ≤ 0, and by observation 8), for each member $\left(\left(i,B\right),X\right)$ of $\psi_A\left(\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right)\right)$, the factor $\left(\frac{c(x,g,B)}{b(x,i)}\right)^{m_{iBX}}$ contributes $-m_{iBX}$, hence the total contribution is $\leq-\sum_{\left(\left(i,B\right),X\right)\in\psi_A\left(\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right)\right)}m_{iBX}$. But m is a member of $\mathbb{A}\left(\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right),\left(D-\xi\left(P,Q,H,u\right)+\mathbb{1}\right)\right)$, hence by the definition of $\mathbb{A}$ on page 78 and the definition of the map $\mathbb{1}$ on page 105,
$\sum_{\left(\left(i,B\right),X\right)\in\psi_A\left(\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right)\right)}m_{iBX}=\left(D_A-\xi_A\left(P,Q,H,u\right)+1\right)$ holds.

11) By Lemma 20, $\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\downarrow\left(\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right),P\right)\right)\right)$ is the set of all the ordered pairs $\left(i,B\right)$ of a member i of $\mathcal{O}\left(V,H\right)=\mathcal{O}\left(Q,H\right)$ and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(V,i\right),\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,i\right)\right)$. (We note that for any member i of $\mathcal{U}(V)$, $\mathcal{C}(Q,i)$ is by definition the unique member A of $\mathcal{M}(Q)=V$ such that $i\in A$ holds, hence $\mathcal{C}(Q,i)=\mathcal{C}(V,i)$.)

12) Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}(Q)$ and (i,B) be any member of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))$ such that $i\in\mathcal{U}(W)$ holds and $\mathcal{C}(W,i)\subseteq A$ holds and $\mathcal{C}(W,i)$ is *not* a subset of $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i)$. Then either $B\subseteq A$ holds and B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$, or else $i\in(\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{K}(P,A,i),H)\vdash\mathcal{T}(A,H))$ holds and $B\in\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{C}(V,i),\mathcal{K}(P,A,i))$ holds. For $\mathcal{C}(W,i)\subseteq A$ implies $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)\subset A$ hence $B\subset A$ holds by observation 11). Now $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i)\cap B$ has the member i hence is nonempty hence either $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i)\subset B$ holds or $B\subseteq\mathcal{K}(P,A,i)$ holds, since B is a member of Q hence does not overlap $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i)$. And if $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i)\subset B$ holds then $B\subseteq A$ holds and B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$. Now suppose that $B\subseteq\mathcal{K}(P,A,i)$ holds. Then B is a member of Q such that $\mathcal{C}(V,i)\subset B$ and $B\subseteq\mathcal{K}(P,A,i)$ both hold, hence $B\in\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{C}(V,i),\mathcal{K}(P,A,i))$ holds. Now by assumption $\mathcal{C}(W,i)$ is *not* a subset of $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i)$, hence since $W\subseteq H$ holds and H is a partition, there is *no* member C of H such that $i\in C$ and $C\subseteq\mathcal{K}(P,A,i)$ both hold, hence $i\in\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{K}(P,A,i),H)$ holds, and furthermore $\mathcal{C}(W,i)\subseteq A$ implies $i\notin\mathcal{T}(A,H)$, hence $i\in(\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{K}(P,A,i),H)\vdash\mathcal{T}(A,H))$ holds.

13) Let (i,B) be any member of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))$. Then the contributions of the factor $\left(\frac{c(x,g,B)}{b(x,i)}\right)^{u_{iB}}$ to the map α are as follows:

The numerator contributes $(-u_{iB})$ to $\alpha_{\{J,K\}}$, where J and K are the two members of the member g_B of $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P,B))$, (or in other words, the member g_B of $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P,B))$ is equal to $\{J,K\}$), and makes no contribution to α_Δ for any member Δ of $\mathcal{D}(\alpha)$ other than the member $g_B=\{J,K\}$.

And if $i\in\mathcal{U}(W)$ holds and $\mathcal{C}(W,i)=\{i,j\}$, then $b(x,i)$ is equal to $\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}-x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}\right|$, and the denominator makes the contribution $(+u_{iB})$ to $\alpha_{\{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)\}}$, and makes no contribution to α_Δ for any member Δ of $\mathcal{D}(\alpha)$ other than the member $\{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)\}$.

And if i is *not* a member of $\mathcal{U}(W)$, then $b(x,i)=1$ holds and the denominator makes no contribution to α_Δ for any member Δ of $\mathcal{D}(\alpha)$.

14) Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}(Q)$ and (i,B) be any member of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))$. Then the contribution of the factor $\left(\frac{c(x,g,B)}{b(x,i)}\right)^{u_{iB}}$ to $\Gamma(\alpha,\mathcal{P}(P,A))$ is ≤ 0 unless $i\in(\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{K}(P,A,i),H)\vdash\mathcal{T}(A,H))$ and $B\in\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{C}(V,i),\mathcal{K}(P,A,i))$ both hold, in which case the contribution is $\leq u_{iB}$.

For $u_{iB} \geq 0$ holds hence by observation 6) above the contribution of the numerator is always ≤ 0. And also by observation 6), the denominator makes no contribution to the map α unless $i \in \mathcal{U}(W)$ holds, and if $i \in \mathcal{U}(W)$ does hold it contributes $+u_{iB}$ to $\alpha_{\{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)\}}$, where $\mathcal{C}(W,i) = \{i,j\}$, and nothing else.

Now suppose the denominator does contribute to $\Gamma(\alpha, \mathcal{P}(P,A))$. Then $\{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i), \mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)\} \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P,A))$ holds, hence by observation 3) above, $\{i,j\} \subseteq A$ holds and $\{i,j\} \subseteq \mathcal{K}(P,A,i)$ does *not* hold. Hence by observation 12) above, either $B \subseteq A$ holds and B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$, or else $i \in (\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{K}(P,A,i), H) \vdash \mathcal{T}(A,H))$ holds and $B \in \mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{C}(V,i), \mathcal{K}(P,A,i))$ holds. And if $B \subseteq A$ holds and B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$, then by observation 2) above, $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P,B)) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P,A))$ holds, hence the member g_B of $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P,B))$ is a member of $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P,A))$, hence the numerator contributes $-u_{iB}$ to $\Gamma(\alpha, \mathcal{P}(P,A))$, hence the total contribution of the factor $\left(\frac{c(x,g,B)}{b(x,i)}\right)^{u_{iB}}$ is ≤ 0.

And finally, by observation 13) above, the total contribution to $\Gamma(\alpha, \mathcal{P}(P,A))$ from the factor $\left(\frac{c(x,g,B)}{b(x,i)}\right)^{u_{iB}}$ is *always* $\leq u_{iB}$.

15) Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}(Q)$. Then $A \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A), H)$ is equal to $\mathcal{T}(A,H) \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A), H)$. For $\mathcal{T}(A,H) \subseteq A$ holds, hence $\mathcal{T}(A,H) \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A), H)$ is certainly a subset of $A \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A), H)$. Now let i be any member of $A \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A), H)$. Then $A \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A), H)$ is nonempty, hence $\mathcal{Y}(P,A) \neq \emptyset$, hence $A \subseteq \mathcal{Y}(P,A)$ holds. And if C was a member of H such that $i \in C$ and $C \subseteq A$ both held, then C would be a member of H such that $i \in C$ and $C \subseteq \mathcal{Y}(P,A)$ both held, hence $i \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A), H)$ implies that there is no member C of H such that $i \in C$ and $C \subseteq A$ both hold, hence $i \in \mathcal{T}(A,H)$ holds, hence $i \in \mathcal{T}(A,H) \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A), H)$ holds.

16) Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}(Q)$, i be any member of $A \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A), H)$, and B be any member of $\mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{K}(P,A,i), A)$. Then $(i,B) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H), P)))$ holds, and the factor $\left(\frac{c(x,g,B)}{b(x,i)}\right)^{u_{iB}}$ contributes $(-u_{iB})$ to $\Gamma(\alpha, \mathcal{P}(P,A))$.

For $i \in A$ holds and $i \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A), H)$ holds, hence $\mathcal{Y}(P,A) \neq \emptyset$ and $i \in \mathcal{O}(V,H)$ holds. And $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i) \subset B$ implies B is *not* a member of $\mathcal{M}(P) = V$, hence $\mathcal{C}(V,i) \subset B$ holds. And $i \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A), H)$ implies furthermore that $\mathcal{Y}(P,A) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)$ holds, hence $A \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)$ holds, hence $B \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)$ holds, hence $B \in \mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{C}(V,i), \mathcal{Z}(P,H,i))$ holds, hence $(i,B) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H), P)))$ holds.

Now $B \in \mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{K}(P,A,i), A)$ implies that $B \subseteq A$ holds and that B is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$, hence by observation 2) above the member g_B of

$\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,B\right)\right)$ is a member of $\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$, hence by observation 13) above the numerator contributes $\left(-u_{iB}\right)$ to $\Gamma\left(\alpha,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$. And $i\in\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)$ implies that *no* member of W that contains i as a member is a subset of A, hence if $i\in\mathcal{U}\left(W\right)$ and $\mathcal{C}\left(W,i\right)=\{i,j\}$ then by observation 3) above $\left\{\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,i\right),\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,j\right)\right\}$ is *not* a member of $\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$, hence the denominator does not contribute to $\Gamma\left(\alpha,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$.

17) Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right)$. Then the total contribution to $\Gamma\left(\alpha,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$ from the factor $\left(\prod_{(i,B)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))}\left(\frac{c\left(x,g,B\right)}{b\left(x,i\right)}\right)^{u_{iB}}\right)$ is

$$\le\left(\sum_{C\in(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash V)}\ \sum_{(i,B)\in(\mathbb{I}_C(Q,H)\vdash\mathbb{I}_A(Q,H))}u_{iB}\right)-\left(\sum_{i\in(A\cap\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A),H))}\ \sum_{B\in\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{K}(P,A,i),A)}u_{iB}\right).$$

For by observation 14) above the factor $\left(\frac{c(x,g,B)}{b(x,i)}\right)^{u_{iB}}$ does *not* give a contribution ≥ 0 unless $i\in\left(\mathcal{T}\left(\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right),H\right)\vdash\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)\right)$ and $B\in\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(V,i\right),\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right)\right)$ both hold, and in that case the contribution is $\leq u_{iB}$. But $i\in\left(\mathcal{T}\left(\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right),H\right)\vdash\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)\right)$ and $B\in\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(V,i\right),\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right)\right)$ imply that there exists a member C of $\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)$, namely $C=\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right)$, such that $i\in\left(\mathcal{T}\left(C,H\right)\vdash\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)\right)$ holds and $B\in\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(V,i\right),C\right)$ holds, and furthermore C is not a member of V, since if C was a member of V then $\mathcal{C}\left(V,i\right)$ would be equal to C, hence $\mathcal{C}\left(V,i\right)\subset B\subseteq C$ could not hold, which contradicts $B\in\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(V,i\right),\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right)\right)$. And conversely, if C is a member of $\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\vdash V\right)$ and i is a member of $\left(\mathcal{T}\left(C,H\right)\vdash\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)\right)$ and B is a member of $\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(V,i\right),C\right)$, then $i\in\left(\mathcal{T}\left(\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right),H\right)\vdash\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)\right)$ holds and $B\in\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(V,i\right),\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right)\right)$ holds. (We note that $i\in\mathcal{T}\left(\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right),H\right)$ implies $i\in\mathcal{O}\left(V,H\right)$ and $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right)\subseteq\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,i\right)$, hence $B\in\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(V,i\right),\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,i\right)\right)$ implies $B\in\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(V,i\right),\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,i\right)\right)$, hence by observation 11) above, (i,B) is a member of $\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\downarrow\left(\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right),P\right)\right)\right)$.)

And furthermore, if C is any member of $\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\vdash V\right)$, then the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (i,B) of a member i of $\left(\mathcal{T}\left(C,H\right)\vdash\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)\right)$ and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(V,i\right),C\right)$, is equal to $\left(\mathbb{I}_C\left(Q,H\right)\vdash\mathbb{I}_A\left(Q,H\right)\right)$. For by definition $\mathbb{I}_C\left(Q,H\right)$ is the set of all ordered pairs (i,B) of a member i of $\mathcal{T}\left(C,H\right)$ and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(V,i\right),C\right)$, hence if i is any member of $\left(\mathcal{T}\left(C,H\right)\vdash\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)\right)$ and B is any member of $\mathbb{Y}\left(Q,\mathcal{C}\left(V,i\right),C\right)$, then (i,B) is certainly a member of $\mathbb{I}_C\left(Q,H\right)$, and furthermore i is *not* a member of $\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)$, hence (i,B) is *not* a member of $\mathbb{I}_A\left(Q,H\right)$, hence (i,B) is a member of $\left(\mathbb{I}_C\left(Q,H\right)\vdash\mathbb{I}_A\left(Q,H\right)\right)$. And if (i,B) is any member of

$(\mathbb{I}_C(Q,H) \vdash \mathbb{I}_A(Q,H))$, then $i \in \mathcal{T}(C,H)$ holds and $B \in \mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{C}(V,i),C)$ holds. But $B \in \mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{C}(V,i),C)$ implies $B \in \mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{C}(V,i),A)$, hence $(i,B) \notin \mathbb{I}_A(Q,H)$ implies $i \notin \mathcal{T}(A,H)$, hence $i \in (\mathcal{T}(C,H) \vdash \mathcal{T}(A,H))$ holds.

Now let i be any member of $A \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A),H)$ and B be any member of $\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{K}(P,A,i),A)$. Then by observation 15) above, i is a member of $\mathcal{T}(A,H) \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A),H)$, and by observation 16) above, $(i,B) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))$ holds and the factor $\left(\frac{c(x,g,B)}{b(x,i)}\right)^{u_{iB}}$ contributes $(-u_{iB})$ to $\Gamma(\alpha,\mathcal{P}(P,A))$. (We note that $i \in \mathcal{T}(A,H) \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A),H)$ implies directly that i is *not* a member of $(\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{K}(P,A,i),H) \vdash \mathcal{T}(A,H))$.)

18) Let A be any member of $(Q \vdash P)$. Then the following identity holds:

$\xi_A(P,Q,H,u) =$

$$= \left(\sum_{C \in (\mathcal{P}(P,A) \vdash V)} \quad \sum_{(i,B) \in (\mathbb{I}_C(Q,H) \cap \mathbb{I}_A(Q,H))} u_{iB}\right) + \left(\sum_{i \in (A \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A),H))} \quad \sum_{B \in \mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{K}(P,A,i),A)} u_{iB}\right)$$

For $\xi_A(P,Q,H,u)$ was defined on page 93 by

$$\xi_A(P,Q,H,u) \equiv \sum_{(i,B) \in (\mathbb{I}_A(Q,H) \cap \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P))))} u_{iB}.$$

Now $\mathbb{I}_A(Q,H) \cap \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))$ is the set of all ordered pairs (i,B) such that $i \in \mathcal{T}(A,H)$ and $B \in \mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{C}(V,i),(A \cap \mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)))$ both hold. And $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i) \subseteq A$ certainly holds. And furthermore $i \in \mathcal{T}(A,H)$ implies that there is no member E of H such that $i \in E$ and $E \subseteq A$ both hold, hence there is no member E of H such that $i \in E$ and $E \subseteq \mathcal{K}(P,A,i)$ both hold, hence $i \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{K}(P,A,i),H)$ holds, hence $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)$ holds since $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)$ is by definition the *largest* member C of P such that $i \in \mathcal{T}(C,H)$ holds.

Hence $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i) \subseteq (A \cap \mathcal{Z}(P,H,i))$ holds, hence $\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{C}(V,i),(A \cap \mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)))$ is equal to the disjoint union of $\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{C}(V,i),\mathcal{K}(P,A,i))$ and $\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{K}(P,A,i),(A \cap \mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)))$.

Now if $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i) \subset A$ holds then $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i) = \mathcal{K}(P,A,i)$ holds, since $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)$ holds as just shown above, and $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i) \subset \mathcal{Z}(P,H,i) \subset A$ cannot hold since $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i)$ is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$, hence $\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{K}(P,A,i),(A \cap \mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)))$ is empty unless $A \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)$ holds. And $A \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)$ implies $\mathcal{Y}(P,A) \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{Y}(P,A) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)$ hence $i \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A),H)$ holds hence $i \in A \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A),H)$

holds. And conversely, $i \in A \cap \mathcal{T}\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(P, A\right), H\right)$ implies $\mathcal{Y}\left(P, A\right) \neq \emptyset$ (for $\mathcal{T}\left(\emptyset, H\right) = \emptyset$) and $\mathcal{Y}\left(P, A\right) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, i\right)$, hence $A \subseteq \mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, i\right)$, hence $\mathbb{Y}\left(Q, \mathcal{K}\left(P, A, i\right), \left(A \cap \mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, i\right)\right)\right) = \mathbb{Y}\left(Q, \mathcal{K}\left(P, A, i\right), A\right)$. Hence the set of all ordered pairs $\left(i, B\right)$ of a member i of $\mathcal{T}\left(A, H\right)$ and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}\left(Q, \mathcal{K}\left(P, A, i\right), \left(A \cap \mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, i\right)\right)\right)$ is equal to the set of all ordered pairs $\left(i, B\right)$ of a member i of $A \cap \mathcal{T}\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(P, A\right), H\right)$ and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}\left(Q, \mathcal{K}\left(P, A, i\right), A\right)$. Hence the following identity holds:

$$\xi_A\left(P, Q, H, u\right) =$$

$$= \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}\left(A, H\right)} \; \sum_{B \in \mathbb{Y}\left(Q, \mathcal{C}\left(V, i\right), \mathcal{K}\left(P, A, i\right)\right)} u_{iB}\right) + \left(\sum_{i \in \left(A \cap \mathcal{T}\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(P, A\right), H\right)\right)} \; \sum_{B \in \mathbb{Y}\left(Q, \mathcal{K}\left(P, A, i\right), A\right)} u_{iB}\right).$$

But the first term in the right-hand side of this identity is equal to

$$\left(\sum_{C \in \left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right) \vdash V\right)} \; \sum_{\left(i, B\right) \in \left(\mathbb{I}_C\left(Q, H\right) \cap \mathbb{I}_A\left(Q, H\right)\right)} u_{iB}\right).$$

For if $i \in \mathcal{T}\left(A, H\right)$ holds and $B \in \mathbb{Y}\left(Q, \mathcal{C}\left(V, i\right), \mathcal{K}\left(P, A, i\right)\right)$ holds then $\left(i, B\right) \in \mathbb{I}_A\left(Q, H\right)$ holds and $i \in \mathcal{K}\left(P, A, i\right)$ holds, and furthermore $\mathcal{K}\left(P, A, i\right)$ is not equal to $\mathcal{C}\left(V, i\right)$ hence $\mathcal{K}\left(P, A, i\right)$ is not a member of V, and furthermore there is no member E of H such that $i \in E$ and $E \subseteq \mathcal{K}\left(P, A, i\right)$ both hold, (for any such E would satisfy both $i \in E$ and $E \subseteq A$, contradicting $i \in \mathcal{T}\left(A, H\right)$), hence $i \in \mathcal{T}\left(\mathcal{K}\left(P, A, i\right), H\right)$ and $\left(i, B\right) \in \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{K}\left(P, A, i\right)}\left(Q, H\right)$ both hold, and conversely if C is any member of $\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right) \vdash V\right)$ and $\left(i, B\right)$ is any member of $\left(\mathbb{I}_C\left(Q, H\right) \cap \mathbb{I}_A\left(Q, H\right)\right)$, then $i \in \mathcal{T}\left(C, H\right) \cap \mathcal{T}\left(A, H\right)$ holds hence $i \in C \cap \mathcal{T}\left(A, H\right)$ holds, and $B \in \mathbb{Y}\left(Q, \mathcal{C}\left(V, i\right), \mathcal{K}\left(P, A, i\right)\right)$ holds.

19) Let A be any member of $\left(Q \vdash P\right)$. Then the following inequality holds:

$$\Gamma\left(\alpha, \mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right) \leq d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right) - 1\right) - 1 - \sum_{C \in \left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right) \vdash V\right)} \left(D_C - \sum_{\left(i, B\right) \in \mathbb{I}_C\left(Q, H\right)} u_{iB}\right).$$

For by pages 111 and 112 the contribution from Θ is equal to

$$d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right) - 1\right) + D_A - \left(\sum_{C \in \left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right) \vdash V\right)} D_C\right),$$

and by observation 10) above the total contribution of the factor $\left(\prod_{\left(\left(i, B\right), X\right) \in \mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\psi\left(\mathbb{J}\left(P, Q, H\right)\right)\right)\right)} \left(\frac{c\left(x, g, B\right)}{b\left(x, i\right)}\right)^{m_{iBX}}\right)$ is $\leq -\left(D_A - \xi_A\left(P, Q, H, u\right) + 1\right)$, which by observation 18) above is

$$\leq -\left(D_A+1\right)+$$

$$+\left(\sum_{C\in(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash V)}\ \sum_{(i,B)\in(\mathbb{I}_C(Q,H)\cap\mathbb{I}_A(Q,H))} u_{iB}\right)+\left(\sum_{i\in(A\cap\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A),H))}\ \sum_{B\in\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{K}(P,A,i),A)} u_{iB}\right),$$

and by observation 17) above, the total contribution from the factor $\left(\prod_{(i,B)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))}\left(\frac{c\left(x,g,B\right)}{b\left(x,i\right)}\right)^{u_{iB}}\right)$ is

$$\leq\left(\sum_{C\in(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash V)}\ \sum_{(i,B)\in(\mathbb{I}_C(Q,H)\vdash\mathbb{I}_A(Q,H))} u_{iB}\right)-\left(\sum_{i\in(A\cap\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}(P,A),H))}\ \sum_{B\in\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{K}(P,A,i),A)} u_{iB}\right),$$

and adding these three bounds and noting that for each member C of $\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\vdash V\right)$, we have the identity

$$\left(\sum_{(i,B)\in(\mathbb{I}_C(Q,H)\cap\mathbb{I}_A(Q,H))} u_{iB}\right)+\left(\sum_{(i,B)\in(\mathbb{I}_C(Q,H)\vdash\mathbb{I}_A(Q,H))} u_{iB}\right)=\sum_{(i,B)\in\mathbb{I}_C(Q,H)} u_{iB},$$

we obtain the stated result.

20) Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)$. Then the following inequality holds:

$$\Gamma\left(\alpha,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)\leq\Bigg(d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)-1\right)+D_A-\left(\sum_{C\in(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash V)} D_C\right)+$$

$$+\left(\sum_{C\in(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash V)}\ \sum_{(i,B)\in(\mathbb{I}_C(Q,H)\vdash\mathbb{I}_A(Q,H))} u_{iB}\right)-\left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}(A,H)}\ \sum_{B\in\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{K}(P,A,i),A)} u_{iB}\right)\Bigg)$$

This follows directly from pages 111 and 112 and observations 9) and 17) above, after noting that when $A\in\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)$ holds, the sum over $i\in\left(A\cap\mathcal{T}\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(P,A\right),H\right)\right)$ in the second term in the result of observation 17) may be re-written as a sum over $i\in\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)$, since $A\in\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)$ implies $\mathcal{Y}\left(P,A\right)=A$ and $\left(A\cap\mathcal{T}\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(P,A\right),H\right)\right)=\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)$.

21) Let $\{J,K\}$ be any member of $\mathcal{D}\left(\alpha\right)$ such that there is *no* member $\{j,k\}$ of W such that $j\in J$ and $k\in K$ both hold. Then $\alpha_{\{J,K\}}\leq 0$ holds. For by the definition on page 110 of the map α, contributions >0 to $\alpha_{\{J,K\}}$ can only come from powers of

$|x_J - x_K|$ in the factor Θ, and from any $b\,(x, i)$ such that $b\,(x, i)$ is equal to $|x_J - x_K|$. But it directly follows from the definition of the factor Θ on page 108 that Θ does not include any nonzero power of any $|x_J - x_K|$ such that there is *no* member $\{j, k\}$ of W such that $j \in J$ and $k \in K$ both hold, and it directly follows from the definition of $b\,(x, i)$ on page 107 that $b\,(x, i)$ is not equal to any $|x_J - x_K|$ such that there is *no* member $\{j, k\}$ of W such that $j \in J$ and $k \in K$ both hold.

Now let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}\,(P)$ and x be any member of $\mathbb{U}_d\,(V, \omega)$ such that $\mathcal{E}\,(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x)$ is nonzero. Then by Lemma 10, $\mathbb{M}\,((P \vdash \{A\})\,, P, H, A, \sigma, R, x)$ does *not* hold. Hence either $\mathbb{L}\,(P, A, x) \geq R$ holds or else there exists a member i of A and a member j of $\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \vdash \{A\})}, A\right) \vdash A\right)$ such that $\{i, j\} \in W$ holds and $\mathbb{L}\,(P, A, x) \geq \sigma \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}\right|$ holds. (We note that if $A = \mathcal{U}\,(V)$ holds then the only possibility is $\mathbb{L}\,(P, A, x) \geq R$.)

We now define I to be the set whose members are all the maps i such that $\mathcal{D}\,(i) = \mathbb{B}\,(P)$, and such that for each member A of $\mathbb{B}\,(P)$, i_A is a member of $\mathcal{Q}\,(\mathcal{P}\,(P, A))$, and we define F to be the set whose members are all the maps f such that $\mathcal{D}\,(f) = \mathbb{B}\,(P)$, and for each member A of $\mathbb{B}\,(P)$, f_A is either R or else is an ordered pair (j, k) of a member j of A and a member k of $\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \vdash \{A\})}, A\right) \vdash A\right)$ such that $\{j, k\} \in W$ holds. And for each member i of I and each member A of $\mathbb{B}\,(P)$ we define $e(x, i, A)$ to be $|x_J - x_K|$ where $i_A = \{J, K\}$, and for each member f of F and each member A of $\mathbb{B}\,(P)$ we define $h(x, f, A)$ to be R if $f_A = R$, and otherwise to be $\sigma \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,k)}\right|$ where $f_A = (j, k)$.

Then if r is any member of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{B}(P)}$ such that $r_A \geq 0$ holds for all $A \in \mathbb{B}\,(P)$, the following inequality holds for all $x \in \mathbb{U}_d\,(V, \omega)$ such that $\mathcal{E}\,(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x) \neq 0$:

$$1 \leq \sum_{\substack{f \in F \\ i \in I}} \prod_{A \in \mathbb{B}(P)} \left(\frac{e\,(x, i, A)}{h\,(x, f, A)}\right)^{r_A}$$

(for there is always at least one term in the right-hand side that is ≥ 1, and every term in the right-hand side is ≥ 0.)

We now define r to be the member of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{B}(P)}$ such that for each member A of $\mathbb{B}\,(P)$,

$$r_A \equiv \left(D_A - \sum_{(i,B) \in \mathbb{I}_A(Q,H)} u_{iB}\right) + \frac{\#\,(\mathbb{B}\,(P) \cap \Xi\,(\mathcal{P}\,(V, A)))}{\#\,(\mathbb{B}\,(\bar{P}))},$$

where we note that $\mathbb{B}(P) \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(V, A))$ is the set of all the members B of $\mathbb{B}(P)$ such that $B \subseteq A$ holds.

Now u is a member of $\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q, H), P), D)$, hence $\sum_{(i,B)\in\mathbb{I}_A(Q,H)} u_{iB} \leq D_A$ holds for every member A of $\mathbb{B}(P)$, hence $r_A \geq 0$ holds for every member A of $\mathbb{B}(P)$.

We now define, for each ordered pair (i, f) of a member i of I and a member f of F,

$$E_{if} \equiv U_g \prod_{A\in\mathbb{B}(P)} \left(\frac{e(x, i, A)}{h(x, f, A)}\right)^{r_A}$$

$$= \mathcal{E}(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x) \left(\prod_{A\in\mathbb{B}(\bar{P})} \Psi(\downarrow(x, \mathcal{P}(P, A)), \alpha)\right) \left(\prod_{A\in\mathbb{B}(P)} \left(\frac{e(x, i, A)}{h(x, f, A)}\right)^{r_A}\right) \Phi$$

Then it follows immediately from the above observations that the following inequality holds for all $x \in \mathbb{U}_d(V, \omega)$:

$$U_g \leq \sum_{\substack{f\in F\\ i\in I}} E_{if}.$$

We shall prove that for every ordered pair (i, f) of a member i of the finite set I and a member f of the finite set F, the integral of E_{if} over $\mathbb{W}$ is finite.

Let i be any member of I and f be any member of F.

We first note that it follows directly from the definition of I that for each member A of $\mathbb{B}(P)$, i_A is a member of $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$, and hence i_A is a member of $\mathcal{D}(\alpha) = \bigcup_{B\in\mathbb{B}(\bar{P})} \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P, B))$.

Now let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}(P)$ such that f_A is not equal to R. Then f_A is an ordered pair (j, k) of a member j of A and a member k of $\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \vdash \{A\})}, A\right) \vdash A\right)$ such that $\{j, k\} \in W$ holds. We note first that it follows immediately from this that $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, j)$ is equal to A. For $W \subseteq H$ holds and H is a partition, hence $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, j)$ is the *largest* member B of P such that $j \in B$ holds and $\{j, k\}$ is *not* a subset of B. Hence $A \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(P, H, j)$ holds. And $k \in \left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \vdash \{A\})}, A\right) \vdash A\right)$ implies that for every member B of P such that $A \subset B$ holds, $k \in B$ holds, hence $\{j, k\} \subseteq B$ holds, hence A is the largest member of P to have j as a member but not to have $\{j, k\}$ as a subset, hence $A = \mathcal{Z}(P, H, j)$.

Now $f_A \neq R$ implies that $A \neq \mathcal{U}(V)$, hence there exists at least one member B of $\mathbb{B}(\bar{P})$, namely $B = \mathcal{U}(V)$, such that $A \subset B$ holds. Let B be the *smallest* member of $\mathbb{B}(\bar{P})$ such that $A \subset B$ holds. Then $A \in \mathcal{P}(P, B)$ holds, hence $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, j) \in$

$\mathcal{P}(P,B)$ holds. And furthermore, $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,k) \in \mathcal{P}(P,B)$ holds. For $W \subseteq H$ holds and H is a partition, hence $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,k)$ is the largest member C of P such that $k \in C$ holds and $\{j,k\}$ is *not* a subset of C, hence j is *not* a member of C. (We note that this implies immediately that $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,k)$ is *not* equal to $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)$.) Now $k \in \left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \vdash \{A\})}, A\right) \vdash A\right)$ implies that k is a member of *every* member E of $\bar{P}$ such that $A \subset E$ holds, hence $k \in B$ holds, hence $\{j,k\} \subseteq B$ holds, hence $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,k) \subset B$ holds. Now suppose there was a member E of P such that $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,k) \subset E \subset B$ held. Then the fact that $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,k)$ is the *largest* member of P to have k as a member but not have j as a member, implies that $j \in E$ holds, hence $\{j,k\} \subseteq E$ holds, hence $A \subset E$ holds, and this contradicts the fact that by definition, B is the *smallest* member of $\bar{P}$ to contain A as a strict subset. Hence there is *no* member E of P such that $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,k) \subset E \subset B$ holds, hence $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,k) \in \mathcal{P}(P,B)$ holds, hence $\{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j), \mathcal{Z}(P,H,k)\} \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P,B))$ holds, hence $\{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j), \mathcal{Z}(P,H,k)\}$ is a member of $\mathcal{D}(\alpha) = \bigcup_{B \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{P})} \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P,B))$.

We now define β to be the map whose domain is equal to $\mathcal{D}(\alpha) = \bigcup_{B \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{P})} \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P,B))$, and such that for each member $\{J,K\}$ of $\mathcal{D}(\beta) = \mathcal{D}(\alpha)$, $\beta_{\{J,K\}}$ is equal to $\alpha_{\{J,K\}}$ plus the negative of the total power of $|x_J - x_K|$ in the expression $\prod_{A \in \mathbb{B}(P)} \left(\frac{e(x,i,A)}{h(x,f,A)}\right)^{r_A}$.

And we define κ to be the product, over the members A of $\mathbb{B}(P)$, of $\frac{1}{R}$ if f_A is equal to R, and of $\frac{1}{\sigma}$ if f_A is not equal to R, and we note that since σ is a finite real number > 0 and R is a finite real number > 0, κ is a finite real number > 0.

Then it follows immediately from these definitions that the following equation holds:

$$E_{if} = \kappa \mathcal{E}(P,Q,H,\sigma,R,x) \left(\prod_{A \in \mathbb{B}(\bar{P})} \Psi\left(\downarrow (x, \mathcal{P}(P,A)), \beta\right) \right) \Phi$$

We now make the following observations:

22) Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}(P)$. Then it follows directly from the definition of the set I that $i_A = \{J,K\}$ is a member of $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P,A))$, hence that the factor $e(x,i,A)^{r_A} = |x_J - x_K|^{r_A}$ makes the contribution $-r_A$ to $\Gamma(\beta, \mathcal{P}(P,A))$.

23) Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}(Q)$ and C be any member of $\mathbb{B}(P)$ such that f_C is not equal to R, so that f_C is an ordered pair (j,k) of a member j of C and a member k of $\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \vdash \{C\})}, C\right) \vdash C\right)$ such that $\{j,k\} \in W$ holds. Then $\{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j), \mathcal{Z}(P,H,k)\}$

is *not* a member of $\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$ unless $C\in\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\vdash V\right)$ holds. For if $\left\{\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,j\right),\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,k\right)\right\}\in\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$ holds, then by observation 3) above, $\{j,k\}\subseteq A$ holds and $\{j,k\}$ is *not* a subset of $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,j\right)$. And $W\subseteq H$ holds hence $\{j,k\}\subseteq A$ implies $\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,j\right)\subset A$, and H is a partition hence $\{j,k\}$ is the *only* member of H to have j as a member, hence the fact that $\{j,k\}$ is *not* a subset of $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,j\right)$ implies that $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,j\right)\subseteq\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,j\right)$ holds. But $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,j\right)\subset\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,j\right)\subset A$ cannot hold since $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,j\right)$ is a member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)$, hence $\mathcal{K}\left(P,A,j\right)=\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,j\right)$ holds, hence $\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,j\right)$ is a member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)$.

And furthermore, as shown on pages 122 and 123, the facts that $C\in\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)$ holds, $j\in C$ holds, and $k\in\left(\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P\vdash\{C\})},C\right)\vdash C\right)$ holds, imply directly that $C\subseteq\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,j\right)$ holds, and that for every member B of P such that $C\subset B$ holds, $\{j,k\}\subseteq B$ holds, hence that $\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,j\right)=C$ holds. Hence C is a member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)$.

And furthermore, C is a member of $\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)$, hence C is not a member of V, hence C is a member of $\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\vdash V\right)$.

24) Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)$. Then it follows directly from observations 22) and 23) above that the contribution to $\Gamma\left(\beta,\mathcal{P}(P,A)\right)$ from the factor $\left(\prod_{A\in\mathbb{B}(P)}\left(\frac{e(x,i,A)}{h(x,f,A)}\right)^{r_A}\right)$ is $\leq\left(\sum_{C\in(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash V)}r_C\right)-r_A$.

And by the definition of the map r,

$$\left(\sum_{C\in(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash V)}r_C\right)-r_A=$$

$$=\left\{\left(\sum_{C\in(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash V)}\left(\left(D_C-\sum_{(i,B)\in\mathbb{I}_C(Q,H)}u_{iB}\right)+\frac{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)\cap\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(V,C\right)\right)\right)}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)}\right)\right)-\left(\left(D_A-\sum_{(i,B)\in\mathbb{I}_A(Q,H)}u_{iB}\right)+\frac{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)\cap\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(V,A\right)\right)\right)}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)}\right)\right\}$$

$$=\left(\sum_{C\in(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash V)}\left(D_C-\sum_{(i,B)\in\mathbb{I}_C(Q,H)}u_{iB}\right)\right)-\left(D_A-\sum_{(i,B)\in\mathbb{I}_A(Q,H)}u_{iB}\right)-\frac{1}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)}$$

25) Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)$. Then the following inequality holds:

$$\Gamma\left(\beta,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)\leq d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)-1\right)-\frac{1}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)}.$$

For by observations 20) and 24) above we have

$$\Gamma\left(\beta,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)\leq\left\{d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)-1\right)+\left(\sum_{(i,B)\in\mathbb{I}_A(Q,H)}u_{iB}\right)\right.$$

$$-\left(\sum_{C\in(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash V)}\ \sum_{(i,B)\in(\mathbb{I}_C(Q,H)\cap\mathbb{I}_A(Q,H))}u_{iB}\right)-\left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}(A,H)}\ \sum_{B\in\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{K}(P,A,i),A)}u_{iB}\right)$$

$$\left.-\frac{1}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)}\right\}$$

And by using the identity

$$\left(\sum_{(i,B)\in\mathbb{I}_A(Q,H)}u_{iB}\right)=$$

$$=\left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}(A,H)}\ \sum_{B\in\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{C}(V,i),\mathcal{K}(P,A,i))}u_{iB}\right)+\left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}(A,H)}\ \sum_{B\in\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{K}(P,A,i),A)}u_{iB}\right)$$

and noting that the first term in the right-hand side of this identity is equal to $\left(\sum_{C\in(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash V)}\ \sum_{(i,B)\in(\mathbb{I}_C(Q,H)\cap\mathbb{I}_A(Q,H))}u_{iB}\right)$, we obtain the stated result.

26) Let A be any member of $(Q\vdash P)$. Then it follows directly from observation 23) above that the contribution to $\Gamma\left(\beta,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$ from the factor $\left(\prod_{A\in\mathbb{B}(P)}\left(\frac{e(x,i,A)}{h(x,f,A)}\right)^{r_A}\right)$ is $\leq\left(\sum_{C\in(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash V)}r_C\right)$.

And by the definition of the map r,

$$\left(\sum_{C\in(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash V)}r_C\right)=$$

$$=\left(\sum_{C\in(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash V)}\left(\left(D_C-\sum_{(i,B)\in\mathbb{I}_C(Q,H)}u_{iB}\right)+\frac{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)\cap\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(V,C\right)\right)\right)}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)}\right)\right).$$

27) Let A be any member of $(Q\vdash P)$. Then the following inequality holds:

$$\Gamma\left(\beta,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)\leq d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)-1\right)-\frac{1}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)}.$$

For by observations 19) and 26) above we have

$$\Gamma\left(\beta,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)\leq\left(d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)-1\right)-1\right)+\left(\sum_{C\in\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\vdash V\right)}\frac{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)\cap\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(V,C\right)\right)\right)}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)}\right)$$

$$=\left(d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)-1\right)-1\right)+\frac{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)\cap\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(V,A\right)\right)\right)}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)}$$

Now A is a member of $(Q\vdash P)$, hence $\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)\cap\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(V,A\right)\right)\right)$ is the number of members B of $\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)$ such that $B\subset A$ holds. And this number is $\leq\left(\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)-1\right)$, since the member $\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)$ of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$ is not a *strict* subset of *any* member of $\Xi\left(V\right)$, and in particular is not a *strict* subset of A. And the stated result follows directly from this.

28) Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right)$. Then directly from observations 25) and 27) above, the following inequality holds:

$$\Gamma\left(\beta,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)\leq d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)-1\right)-\frac{1}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)}.$$

29) Let $\{J,K\}$ be any member of $\mathcal{D}\left(\beta\right)=\mathcal{D}\left(\alpha\right)$ such that there is *no* member $\{j,k\}$ of W such that $j\in J$ and $k\in K$ both hold. Then $\beta_{\{J,K\}}\leq 0$ holds. For $\alpha_{\{J,K\}}\leq 0$ holds by observation 21) above, and by the definition on page 121 of $h\left(x,f,A\right)$, $h\left(x,f,A\right)$ is either equal to R or else is equal to $\left|x_B-x_C\right|$, where B and C are members of P such that there *does* exist a member $\{j,k\}$ of W such that $j\in B$ and $k\in C$ both hold, hence it directly follows from the definition on page 123 of the map β that $\beta_{\{J,K\}}\leq 0$ holds.

Now the factor Φ was defined on page 108 by

$$\Phi\equiv\left(\prod_{\Delta\equiv\{j,k\}\in W}\mathbb{S}\left(T-\left(1-2\lambda\right)\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,j)}-x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,k)}\right|\right)\right).$$

Now every member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$ is $(V\cup W)$-connected, hence every member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$ is $\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\cup W\right)$-connected.

Let $L\equiv\left(\frac{T}{1-2\lambda}\right)\max_{A\in\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)}\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)-1\right)$.

Now as shown on pages 109-110, $\{j,k\}\in W$ implies that $\left\{\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,j\right),\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,k\right)\right\}\in\bigcup_{A\in\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)}\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$ holds. Hence it follows directly from Lemma 15 that

$$\Phi\leq\prod_{A\in\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)}\left(\prod_{\Delta\equiv\{J,K\}\in\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)}\mathbb{S}\left(L-\left|x_J-x_K\right|\right)\right)$$

holds. Hence, using the definition of $\mathcal{B}$ on page 27, we have

$$\Phi \leq \prod_{A \in \mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)} \mathcal{B}\left(\downarrow\left(x, \mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right), L\right).$$

And by page 62 we have

$$\mathcal{E}\left(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x\right) \leq \mathcal{H}\left(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x\right),$$

hence by Lemma 13 we have

$$\mathcal{E}\left(P, Q, H, \sigma, R, x\right) \leq$$

$$\leq \prod_{A \in \mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)} \mathcal{H}\left(P \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right), Q \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right), H, \sigma, R, \downarrow\left(x, \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right)\right)\right).$$

For each member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$ we define $Z_A \equiv \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right)$.

Then it immediately follows from the foregoing that the following inequality holds:

$$E_{if} \leq$$

$$\leq \kappa \prod_{A \in \mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)} \left(\mathcal{H}(P \cap Z_A, Q \cap Z_A, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, Z_A))\, \Psi(\downarrow(x, \mathcal{P}(P, A)), \beta)\, \mathcal{B}(\downarrow(x, \mathcal{P}(P, A)), L)\right)$$

Now by definition, $\mathbb{U}_d\left(V, \omega\right)$ is the set of all members x of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\Xi(V)}$ such that for each member A of $\left(\Xi\left(V\right) \vdash V\right)$, $x_A = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{P}(V, A)} \omega_{AB} x_B$ holds.

We now choose a map S such that $\mathcal{D}\left(S\right) = \mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$, and such that for each member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$, S_A is a member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$. And for every member B of $\left(P \vdash \left\{\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)\right\}\right)$, we define $z_B \equiv \left(x_B - x_{S_A}\right)$, where A is the *smallest* member C of $\bar{P}$ such that $B \subset C$ holds, or in other words, where $A = \mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{\left(P \vdash \{B\}\right)}, B\right)$. (We note that x_{S_A} means $x_{(S_A)}$, in accordance with our general rule for interpreting a subscript on a subscript, stated on page 20.)

This means that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$, and B and C are any members of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$, then the equation $\left(x_B - x_C\right) = \left(z_B - z_C\right)$ holds.

We note that if B is a member of $\mathcal{R}\left(S\right)$, then $S_{\mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{\left(P \vdash \{B\}\right)}, B\right)} = B$ holds, hence $z_B = 0$ holds.

Now $\bar{P}$ is equal to the disjoint union of $\left\{\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)\right\}$ and all the $\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$, $A \in \mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$, hence

$$\#\left(\bar{P}\right) = 1 + \sum_{A \in \mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)} \#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right)$$

holds hence

$$\#\left(V\right)=\#\left(\bar{P}\right)-\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)=1+\sum_{A\in\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)}\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)-1\right)$$

holds hence

$$\#\left(V\right)=1+\#\left(P\vdash\left(\mathcal{R}\left(S\right)\cup\left\{\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)\right\}\right)\right)$$

holds.

And furthermore, the x_A, $A\in V$, may be expressed in terms of the z_B, $B\in\left(P\vdash\left(\mathcal{R}\left(S\right)\cup\left\{\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)\right\}\right)\right)$, together with $x_{\mathcal{U}(V)}$.

For if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$, then $x_A=\sum_{B\in\mathcal{P}(P,A)}\omega_{AB}x_B$ holds by Lemma 4. And as noted above, for each member B of $\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)$, $z_B=\left(x_B-x_{S_A}\right)$ holds. Hence

$$\sum_{B\in\mathcal{P}(P,A)}\omega_{AB}z_B=\sum_{B\in\mathcal{P}(P,A)}\omega_{AB}\left(x_B-x_{S_A}\right)=\left(x_A-x_{S_A}\right)$$

holds, hence $x_{S_A}=x_A-\sum_{B\in\mathcal{P}(P,A)}\omega_{AB}z_B$ holds, hence for all members B of $\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)$ we have

$$x_B=z_B+x_{S_A}=x_A+\left(z_B-\sum_{C\in\mathcal{P}(P,A)}\omega_{AC}z_C\right).$$

From this we find directly that, for any member i of $\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)$,

$$x_{\mathcal{C}(V,i)}=x_{\mathcal{U}(V)}+\sum_{A\in\mathbb{Y}\left(\bar{P},\mathcal{C}(V,i),\mathcal{U}(V)\right)}\left(z_{\mathcal{K}(P,A,i)}-\sum_{C\in\mathcal{P}(P,A)}\omega_{AC}z_C\right).$$

Furthermore, the linear transformation from the variables x_A, $A\in V$, to the variables z_B, $B\in\left(P\vdash\left(\mathcal{R}\left(S\right)\cup\left\{\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)\right\}\right)\right)$, and $x_{\mathcal{U}(V)}$, may be realized as a sequence of linear transformations, each associated with one member of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$, and each of the type considered in Lemma 24. Hence the linear transformation from the variables x_A, $A\in V$, to the variables z_B, $B\in\left(P\vdash\left(\mathcal{R}\left(S\right)\cup\left\{\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)\right\}\right)\right)$, and $x_{\mathcal{U}(V)}$, has determinant equal to 1.

And furthermore, the particular equation of the above form when the member i of $\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)$ is taken to be h, where h is the particular member of $\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)$ such that $x_{\mathcal{C}(V,h)}$ has the fixed value b in the definition of the integration domain $\mathbb{W}$, may be used to express $x_{\mathcal{U}(V)}$ in terms of $x_{\mathcal{C}(V,h)}$ and the z_B, $B\in\left(P\vdash\left(\mathcal{R}\left(S\right)\cup\left\{\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)\right\}\right)\right)$, and thus transform from the variables $x_{\mathcal{U}(V)}$ and the z_B, $B\in\left(P\vdash\left(\mathcal{R}\left(S\right)\cup\left\{\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)\right\}\right)\right)$, to the variables

$x_{\mathcal{C}(V,h)}$ and the z_B, $B \in (P \vdash (\mathcal{R}(S) \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}))$. And this final linear transformation has the form of a triangular linear transformation with every diagonal element equal to 1, and thus has determinant equal to 1.

We now make this linear transformation, with determinant equal to 1, from the integration variables x_A, $A \in (V \vdash \{\mathcal{C}(V,h)\})$, to the variables z_B, $B \in (P \vdash (\mathcal{R}(S) \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}))$. Then the above bound on E_{if} shows that the integral of E_{if} over $\mathbb{W}$ is bounded by the finite real number κ multiplied by the product, over the members A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$, of the integral

$$\int \left(\prod_{B \in (\mathcal{P}(P,A) \vdash \{S_A\})} d^d z_B \right) \{\mathcal{H}(P \cap Z_A, Q \cap Z_A, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow(z, Z_A))\, \Psi(\downarrow(z, \mathcal{P}(P,A)), \beta) \times$$

$$\times \mathcal{B}(\downarrow(z, \mathcal{P}(P,A)), L)\}.$$

(We note that with our new choice of independent integration variables, $z_{S_A} \equiv 0$ holds, and the members of $\downarrow(z, Z_A)$ depend *only* on the z_B, $B \in \mathcal{P}(P,A)$, or in other words, *only* on the z_B, $B \in (\mathcal{P}(P,A) \vdash \{S_A\})$.)

Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$. We insert into the above integral for A the identity

$$1 = \sum_{F \in \mathbb{H}(\mathcal{P}(P,A))} \mathcal{A}(\downarrow(z, \mathcal{P}(P,A)), \sigma, F),$$

where by the definition of the function $\mathcal{A}$ on page 27, $\mathcal{A}(\downarrow(z, \mathcal{P}(P,A)), \sigma, F)$ is equal to 1 if the set $\mathcal{F}(\downarrow(z, \mathcal{P}(P,A)), \sigma)$ of all the σ-clusters of $\downarrow(z, \mathcal{P}(P,A))$ is equal to F, and equal to 0 otherwise, and $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{P}(P,A))$ is the set whose members are all the greenwoods F of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$ such that $\mathcal{P}(P,A) \in F$ holds.

(We note that the greenwoods of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$ are *not* the same as the woods of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$. Rather if F is any greenwood of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$, then the set whose members are all the $\mathcal{U}(X)$, $X \in F$, is a wood of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$, and if G is any wood of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$, then the set whose members are all the one-member subsets of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$, together with all the $\mathcal{P}(P,B)$, $B \in \mathbb{B}(G)$, is a greenwood of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$. This situation arises because we worked with the greenwoods of a set, rather than the woods of a partition, in "Cluster Convergence Theorem Theorem".)

Let F be any member of the finite set $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{P}(P,A))$. We shall show that the following integral is finite:

$$\int \left(\prod_{B \in (\mathcal{P}(P,A) \vdash \{S_A\})} d^d z_B \right) \{\mathcal{A}(\downarrow(z, \mathcal{P}(P,A)), \sigma, F)\, \mathcal{H}(P \cap Z_A, Q \cap Z_A, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow(z, Z_A)) \times$$

$$\times\Psi\left(\downarrow\left(z,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right),\beta\right)\mathcal{B}\left(\downarrow\left(z,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right),L\right)\}$$

We first note that by Lemma 11 and the Additional Note on page 60, if Y is a nonempty subset of a member X of F such that $\mathcal{U}\left(Y\right)$ is *not* a member of P, (hence $\#\left(Y\right)\geq 2$ holds, and if $A=\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)$ and $\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)\notin P$ do not *both* hold, then Y is *not* equal to $\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)$), $\mathcal{U}\left(Y\right)$ is $(V\cup H)$-connected, and Y is *not* a strict subset of any subset Z of X such that $\mathcal{U}\left(Z\right)$ is $(V\cup H)$-connected, then either $\mathcal{U}\left(Y\right)\in\left(Q\vdash P\right)$ holds or else the product $\mathcal{A}\left(\downarrow\left(z,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right),\sigma,F\right)\mathcal{H}\left(P\cap Z_A,Q\cap Z_A,H,\sigma,R,\downarrow\left(z,Z_A\right)\right)$ vanishes whenever $\mathbb{L}\left(P\cap Z_A,\mathcal{U}\left(Y\right),\downarrow\left(z,Z_A\right)\right)<R$ holds. For the factor $\mathcal{A}\left(\downarrow\left(z,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right),\sigma,F\right)$ vanishes unless X is a σ-cluster of $\downarrow\left(z,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$. And the factor $\mathcal{H}\left(P\cap Z_A,Q\cap Z_A,H,\sigma,R,\downarrow\left(z,Z_A\right)\right)$ vanishes unless $\left(\left(P\cap Z_A\right),\left(Q\cap Z_A\right)\right)$ is a member of $\Omega\left(H,\sigma,R,\downarrow\left(z,Z_A\right)\right)$, and there is *no* wood G of $\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)$ such that $\left(Q\cap Z_A\right)\subset G$ holds and $\left(\left(P\cap Z_A\right),G\right)\in\Omega\left(H,\sigma,R,\downarrow\left(z,Z_A\right)\right)$ holds. But by Lemma 11 this means that if $\mathcal{A}\left(\downarrow\left(z,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right),\sigma,F\right)\neq 0$, so X is a σ-cluster of $\downarrow\left(z,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$, and $\mathcal{H}\left(P\cap Z_A,Q\cap Z_A,H,\sigma,R,\downarrow\left(z,Z_A\right)\right)\neq 0$, then either $\mathbb{L}\left(P\cap Z_A,\mathcal{U}\left(Y\right),\downarrow\left(z,Z_A\right)\right)\geq R$ holds or $\mathcal{U}\left(Y\right)\in\left(Q\vdash P\right)$ holds.

(We note in passing that by Lemma 6 (f) the factor $\mathcal{A}\left(\downarrow\left(z,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right),\sigma,F\right)\mathcal{H}\left(P\cap Z_A,Q\cap Z_A,H,\sigma,R,\downarrow\left(z,Z_A\right)\right)$ vanishes if any such Y overlaps any member of $\left(Q\vdash P\right)$, but we do not use this.)

Let M be the set whose members are all the nonempty subsets Y of members X of F such that $\mathcal{U}\left(Y\right)$ is *not* a member of Q, (hence $\#\left(Y\right)\geq 2$ holds), $\mathcal{U}\left(Y\right)$ is $(V\cup H)$-connected, and Y is *not* a strict subset of any subset Z of X such that $\mathcal{U}\left(Z\right)$ is $(V\cup H)$-connected. Let T be the set whose members are all the maps s such that $\mathcal{D}\left(s\right)=M$, and for each member Y of M, s_Y is a member of $\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,\mathcal{U}\left(Y\right)\right)\right)$. And for each member s of T and each member Y of M we define $t\left(z,s,Y\right)\equiv\left|z_J-z_K\right|$, where J and K are the two members of s_Y, or in other words, $s_Y=\{J,K\}$.

Then if v is any member of $\mathbb{R}^M$ such that $v_Y\geq 0$ holds for every member Y of M, it follows directly from the above that the following inequality holds for all z such that $\mathcal{A}\left(\downarrow\left(z,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right),\sigma,F\right)\mathcal{H}\left(P\cap Z_A,Q\cap Z_A,H,\sigma,R,\downarrow\left(z,Z_A\right)\right)\neq 0$:

$$1\leq\sum_{s\in S}\prod_{Y\in M}\left(\frac{t\left(z,s,Y\right)}{R}\right)^{v_Y}$$

We now choose a real number η such that $\eta\geq\frac{1}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)\right)}$holds, and define v to be the member of $\mathbb{R}^M$ such that for each member Y of M, $v_Y\equiv\max\left(\left(\eta+\Gamma\left(\beta,Y\right)-d\left(\#\left(Y\right)-1\right)\right),\eta\right)$ holds, and multiply the integrand of the above integral for the member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$ by the above inequality with this choice of the map v.

Let s be any member of T. We shall show that the following integral is finite:

$$\int\left(\prod_{B\in(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash\{S_A\})}d^dz_B\right)\left\{\mathcal{A}\left(\downarrow\left(z,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right),\sigma,F\right)\mathcal{H}\left(P\cap Z_A,Q\cap Z_A,H,\sigma,R,\downarrow\left(z,Z_A\right)\right)\times\right.$$

$$\left.\times\Psi\left(\downarrow\left(z,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right),\beta\right)\left(\prod_{Y\in M}\left(\frac{t\left(z,s,Y\right)}{R}\right)^{v_Y}\right)\mathcal{B}\left(\downarrow\left(z,\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right),L\right)\right\}.$$

We first note that the factor $\mathcal{H}\left(P\cap Z_A,Q\cap Z_A,H,\sigma,R,\downarrow\left(z,Z_A\right)\right)$ satisfies $0\leq\mathcal{H}\left(P\cap Z_A,Q\cap Z_A,H,\sigma,R,\downarrow\left(z,Z_A\right)\right)\leq1$ for all z, and the other factors in the integrand are all ≥0 for all z, hence we may drop the factor $\mathcal{H}\left(P\cap Z_A,Q\cap Z_A,H,\sigma,R,\downarrow\left(z,Z_A\right)\right)$, and we now do that.

We now define γ to be the map whose domain is $\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$, and such that for each member $\{J,K\}$ of $\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$, $\gamma_{\{J,K\}}$ is equal to $\beta_{\{J,K\}}$ plus the negative of the total power of $|z_J-z_K|$ in the factor $\prod_{Y\in M}\left(\frac{t(z,s,Y)}{R}\right)^{v_Y}$.

Now the contribution of the factor $\prod_{Y\in M}\left(\frac{t(z,s,Y)}{R}\right)^{v_Y}$ to $\gamma_{\{J,K\}}$ is ≤0 for all $\{J,K\}\in\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$, hence $\gamma_{\{J,K\}}\leq\beta_{\{J,K\}}$ holds for all $\{J,K\}\in\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$. Hence by the above observation 28), on page 126, if B is any member of $Q\cap(\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)\vdash\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right))$, then $\Gamma\left(\gamma,\mathcal{P}\left(P,B\right)\right)\leq d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,B\right)\right)-1\right)-\frac{1}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)}$ holds.

And by construction, if Y is any member of M, then

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma\left(\gamma,Y\right)&\leq\Gamma\left(\beta,Y\right)-\max\left(\left(\eta+\Gamma\left(\beta,Y\right)-d\left(\#\left(Y\right)-1\right)\right),\eta\right)\\&\leq d\left(\#\left(Y\right)-1\right)-\eta\\&\leq d\left(\#\left(Y\right)-1\right)-\frac{1}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)}\end{aligned}$$

holds.

Hence if Y is *any* subset of a member X of F such that $\#\left(Y\right)\geq2$ holds, $\mathcal{U}\left(Y\right)$ is $\left(V\cup H\right)$-connected, and Y is *not* a strict subset of any subset Z of X such that $\mathcal{U}\left(Z\right)$ is $\left(V\cup H\right)$-connected, then

$$\Gamma\left(\gamma,Y\right)\leq d\left(\#\left(Y\right)-1\right)-\frac{1}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)}$$

holds.

Now if $\{J, K\}$ is any member of $\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right)$ such that there is no member $\{j, k\}$ of W such that $j \in J$ holds and $k \in K$ holds, then by observation 29) on page 126, together with the fact that $\gamma_{\{B,C\}} \leq \beta_{\{B,C\}}$ holds for every member $\{B, C\}$ of $\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right)$, we find that $\gamma_{\{J,K\}} \leq 0$ holds.

We define the set U to be the subset of $\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right)$ such that if $\{B, C\}$ is a member of $\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right)$, then $\{B, C\}$ is a member of U ifif there exists a member $\{i, j\}$ of W such that $i \in B$ holds and $j \in C$ holds. It then follows that if X is any nonempty subset of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$, then $\mathcal{U}\left(X\right)$ is $(V \cup H)$-connected ifif X is U-connected. For suppose first that $\mathcal{U}\left(X\right)$ is $(V \cup H)$-connected. Then if $\{J, K\}$ is any partition of $\mathcal{U}\left(X\right)$, there exists a member C of $(V \cup H)$ such that $C \cap J$ and $C \cap K$ are both nonempty. Let $\{Y, Z\}$ be any partition of X. Then $\{\mathcal{U}\left(Y\right), \mathcal{U}\left(Z\right)\}$ is a partition of $\mathcal{U}\left(X\right)$, hence there exists a member C of $(V \cup H)$ such that $C \cap \mathcal{U}\left(Y\right)$ and $C \cap \mathcal{U}\left(Z\right)$ are both nonempty. Now if E is any member of V, then either $E \subseteq \mathcal{U}\left(Y\right)$ holds or $E \cap \mathcal{U}\left(Y\right) = \emptyset$ holds, and either $E \subseteq \mathcal{U}\left(Z\right)$ holds or $E \cap \mathcal{U}\left(Z\right) = 0$ holds, hence C cannot be a member of V, hence C is a member of H, and furthermore, since C has at least two members and is not a subset of any member of V, C is a member of W. And $C \cap \mathcal{U}\left(Y\right) \neq \emptyset$ implies that there exists a member J of Y such that $C \cap J \neq \emptyset$, and $C \cap \mathcal{U}\left(Z\right) \neq \emptyset$ implies that there exists a member K of Z such that $C \cap K \neq \emptyset$, and by the definition of U, $\{J, K\}$ is a member of U. Hence there exists a member $\{J, K\}$ of U such that $\{J, K\} \cap Y \neq \emptyset$ and $\{J, K\} \cap Z \neq \emptyset$. Hence X is U-connected.

Now assume that X is U-connected. Then if $\{Y, Z\}$ is any partition of X, there exists a member $\{J, K\}$ of U such that $\{J, K\} \cap Y \neq \emptyset$ and $\{J, K\} \cap Z \neq \emptyset$, hence there exists a member $\{J, K\}$ of U such that $J \in Y$ holds and $K \in Z$ holds. Let $\{E, F\}$ be any partition of $\mathcal{U}\left(X\right)$ into two nonempty parts. Suppose first that some member C of X intersects both E and F. Then $C \subseteq \mathcal{U}\left(X\right)$ holds, hence $\{\left(C \cap E\right), \left(C \cap F\right)\}$ is a partition of C into two nonempty parts $(C \cap E)$ and $(C \cap F)$, hence the fact that C is a member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$, hence that C is $(V \cup H)$-connected, implies that there exists a member G of $(V \cup H)$ such that G intersects both $(C \cap E)$ and $(C \cap F)$, hence G intersects both E and F. Now suppose that no member C of X intersects both E and F. Then if B is any member of C, exactly one of $B \subseteq E$ and $B \subseteq F$ holds, and the fact that E is nonempty implies that there is at least one member B of X such that $B \subseteq E$ holds, and the fact that F is nonempty implies that there is at least one member B of X such that $B \subseteq F$ holds, hence if we define Y to be the set whose members are all the members B of X such that $B \subseteq E$ holds and we define Z to be the set whose members are all the members B of X such that $B \subseteq F$ holds, then $\{Y, Z\}$ is a partition of X into two nonempty parts, hence there exists a member $\{J, K\}$ of U such that $J \in Y$ holds and $K \in Z$ holds. Now $\{J, K\} \in U$ implies that there exists a member C of H such that $C \cap J$ and $C \cap K$ are both nonempty, hence, since $E = \mathcal{U}(Y)$ holds and $F = \mathcal{U}(Z)$ holds, $C \cap E$ and $C \cap F$ are both nonempty. Hence $\mathcal{U}(X)$ is $(V \cup H)$-connected.

It follows directly from this that if X is any nonempty subset of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, and Y is any nonempty subset of X such that $\mathcal{U}(Y)$ is $(V \cup H)$-connected and Y is *not* a strict subset of any subset Z of X such that $\mathcal{U}(Z)$ is $(V \cup H)$-connected, then Y is a U-connected component of X, hence by Lemma 2, if F is the set whose members are all the nonempty subsets Y of X such that $\mathcal{U}(Y)$ is $(V \cup H)$-connected, and Y is *not* a strict subset of any subset Z of X such that $\mathcal{U}(Z)$ is $(V \cup H)$-connected, then F is a partition of X.

Now let X be any member of F such that $\#(F) \geq 2$ holds. Then it follows immediately from the above that $\Gamma(\gamma, X)$ is equal to the sum of $\Gamma(\gamma, Y)$ over all the nonempty subsets Y of X such that $\mathcal{U}(Y)$ is $(V \cup H)$-connected and Y is *not* a strict subset of any subset Z of X such that $\mathcal{U}(Z)$ is $(V \cup H)$-connected, plus the sum of $\gamma_{\{J,K\}}$ over members $\{J, K\}$ of $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$ such that J and K are members of two *distinct* such subsets Y of X. Now if J is a member of such a subset Y_1 of X and K is a member of a different such subset Y_2 of X, then there can be no member $\{j, k\}$ of W such that $j \in J$ holds and $k \in K$ holds, for $W \subseteq H$ holds hence if there was such a member of W then, by Lemma 1 and page 52, $(Y_1 \cup Y_2)$ would be a $(V \cup H)$-connected subset of X such that $Y_1 \subset (Y_1 \cup Y_2)$ holds and $Y_2 \subset (Y_1 \cup Y_2)$ holds, which contradicts the assumed properties of Y_1 and Y_2. Hence $\gamma_{\{J,K\}} \leq 0$ holds.

Thus if X is any member of F such that $\#(X) \geq 2$ holds, then

$$\Gamma(\gamma, X) \leq d(\#(X) - n) - \frac{n}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)}$$

holds, where n is the number of U-connected components of X. But $n \geq 1$ holds, hence

$$\Gamma(\gamma, X) \leq d(\#(X) - 1) - \frac{1}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)}$$

holds.

Hence by the Cluster Convergence Theorem, the integral

$$\int \left(\prod_{B \in (\mathcal{P}(P,A) \vdash \{S_A\})} d^d z_B \right) \mathcal{A}\left(\downarrow(z, \mathcal{P}(P, A)), \sigma, F\right) \Psi\left(\downarrow(z, \mathcal{P}(P, A)), \gamma\right) \mathcal{B}\left(\downarrow(z, \mathcal{P}(P, A)), L\right),$$

or in other words, the integral

$$\int\left(\prod_{B\in(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash\{S_A\})}d^dt_B\right)\mathcal{A}\left(t,\sigma,F\right)\Psi\left(t,\gamma\right)\mathcal{B}\left(t,L\right),$$

is finite.

And this concludes the proof of Theorem 1.

7 Second Convergence Theorem.

If A is a set, and U is a set such that every member of U is a set, then a *U-key of A* is a member E of U such that there exists a partition $\{B,C\}$ of A into two nonempty parts B and C such that $B\cap E\neq\emptyset$, $C\cap E\neq\emptyset$, and E is the *only* member of U to have nonempty intersection with both B and C.

If A is a set, U is a set such that every member of U is a set, and V is a subset of U, then we shall say that A is *U-firm over V* ifif A is U-connected and every U-key of A is a member of V.

If A is a set, U is a set such that every member of U is a set, and V is a subset of U, then a *U-firm over V component of A* is a nonempty subset B of A such that B is U-firm over V and B is *not* a strict subset of any subset of A that is U-firm over V.

If H is a set such that every member of H is a set, and F is a wood, then we shall say that F is *H-principal* ifif every member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(F\right)$ is $\left(\mathcal{M}\left(F\right)\cup H\right)$-connected, every member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(F\right)$ has at least one $\left(\mathcal{M}\left(F\right)\cup H\right)$-key E such that $E\notin\mathcal{M}\left(F\right)$ holds, and if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(F\right)$ and B is any member of F such that $B\subset A$ holds, then B is a subset of an $\left(\mathcal{M}\left(F\right)\cup H\right)$-firm over $\mathcal{M}\left(F\right)$ component of A.

For every ordered pair (F,H) of a wood F and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathbb{P}\left(F,H\right)$ to be the set whose members are the members of $\mathcal{M}\left(F\right)$, together with any members A of $\mathbb{B}\left(F\right)$ that satisfy both the following requirements:

(i) A has at least one $\left(\mathcal{M}\left(F\right)\cup H\right)$-key E such that $E\notin\mathcal{M}\left(F\right)$ holds

(ii) if B is any member of F such that $B\subset A$ holds, then B is a subset of an $\left(\mathcal{M}\left(F\right)\cup H\right)$-firm over $\mathcal{M}\left(F\right)$ component of A.

We note that it follows immediately from this definition that if V is any partition such that $\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)$ is finite and $\#\left(V\right)\geq 2$ holds, H is any set such that every member of H is a set, and F is any member of $\mathcal{G}\left(V,H\right)$, (or in other words, F is any wood of V

such that every member of F is $(V \cup H)$-connected), then $\mathbb{P}(F, H)$ is an H-principal wood of V.

For any ordered pair (V, H) of a partition V such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathcal{V}(V, H)$ to be the set whose members are all the woods F of V such that every member A of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V, and we define $\mathcal{W}(V, H)$ to be the set whose members are all the H-principal woods of V.

For any ordered pair (G, H) such that H is a set such that every member of H is a set, and G is an H-principal wood, we define $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$ to be the set whose members are all the members F of $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M}(G), H)$ such that $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}(F, H)$ holds. Thus $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$ is the set whose members are all the members F of $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M}(G), H)$ such that $G \subseteq F$ holds, and if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ and B is any member of F such that $B \subset A$ holds, then B is a subset of an $(\mathcal{M}(F) \cup H)$-firm over $\mathcal{M}(F)$ component of A.

Lemma 25. If U is a set such that every member of U is a set, A is a nonempty U-connected set, E is a U-key of A, and $\{B, C\}$ is a partition of A into two nonempty parts B and C such that $B \cap E \neq \emptyset$, $C \cap E \neq \emptyset$, and E is the *only* member of U to have nonempty intersection with both B and C, then B is U-connected.

Proof. Suppose B is not U-connected. Then there exists a partition $\{J, K\}$ of B into two nonempty parts J and K such that *no* member S of U intersects both J and K. Let $\{J, K\}$ be such a partition of B. Now E is a member of U hence E cannot intersect both J and K. Suppose for definiteness that $J \cap E = \emptyset$. Then $\{J, (C \cup K)\}$ is a partition of A into two nonempty parts J and $(C \cup K)$ such that no member S of U intersects both J and $(C \cup K)$. For if S is a member of U such that S intersects both J and $(C \cup K)$, then $S \neq E$ since $J \cap E = \emptyset$. Hence S is a member of U, different from E, such that $J \cap S \neq \emptyset$, hence $B \cap S \neq \emptyset$, and $(C \cup K) \cap S \neq \emptyset$, hence S intersects at least one of C and K. But $S \neq E$ implies $C \cap S = \emptyset$, since $B \cap S \neq \emptyset$, and $J \cap S \neq \emptyset$ implies $K \cap S = \emptyset$, since by assumption *no* member of U intersects both J and K.

Hence, as stated, $\{J, (C \cup K)\}$ is a partition of A into two nonempty parts such that *no* member of U intersects both parts. But this contradicts the assumption that A is U-connected.

Lemma 26. If U is a set such that every member of U is a set, A is a U-connected set, S and T are *distinct* U-keys of A, $\{B, C\}$ is a partition of A such that $B \cap S \neq \emptyset$,

$C \cap S \neq \emptyset$, and S is the *only* member of U to have nonempty intersection with both B and C, and $B \cap T = \emptyset$ holds, and $\{D, E\}$ is a partition of A such that $D \cap T \neq \emptyset$, $E \cap T \neq \emptyset$, and T is the *only* member of U to have nonempty intersection with both D and E, and $E \cap S = \emptyset$ holds, then $B \cap E = \emptyset$ holds.

Proof. Suppose that $B \cap E \neq \emptyset$ holds. Now $B \cap D$ is nonempty since $B = (B \cap D) \cup (B \cap E)$, $B \cap S \neq \emptyset$, and $E \cap S = \emptyset$ all hold, hence $\{(B \cap D), (B \cap E)\}$ is a partition of B, hence since B is U-connected by Lemma 25, there is a member W of U such that $(B \cap D) \cap W \neq \emptyset$ and $(B \cap E) \cap W \neq \emptyset$ both hold, and $W \neq T$ holds since $B \cap T = \emptyset$ holds by assumption. But this implies that W is a member of U, different from T, such that $D \cap W \neq \emptyset$ and $E \cap W \neq \emptyset$ both hold, and by assumption there is no such member of U.

Lemma 27. Let U be a set such that every member of U is a set, let A be a nonempty U-connected set, and let i and j be any members of A such that $i \neq j$. Then there exists a finite integer $n \geq 0$ and a map M such that $\mathcal{D}(M)$ is the set of all the integers r such that $0 \leq r \leq n$ holds, and for each member r of $\mathcal{D}(M)$, M_r is a member of U, and for all r such that $0 \leq r$ and $r \leq (n-1)$ both hold, $A \cap (M_r \cap M_{r+1})$ is nonempty, and $i \in M_0$ holds and $j \in M_n$ holds.

Proof. Let B be the subset of A whose members are all the members k of A such that there *exists* a finite integer $n \geq 0$ and a map M such that $\mathcal{D}(M)$ is the set of all the integers r such that $0 \leq r \leq n$ holds, and for each member r of $\mathcal{D}(M)$, M_r is a member of U, and for all r such that $0 \leq r$ and $r \leq (n-1)$ both hold, $A \cap (M_r \cap M_{r+1})$ is nonempty, and $i \in M_0$ holds and $k \in M_n$ holds. Then i is a member of B, since A has at least two members, hence there exists a member E of U such that $i \in E$ holds. Hence B is nonempty. Now *suppose* $A \vdash B$ was nonempty. Then $\{B, (A \vdash B)\}$ would be a partition of A into two nonempty parts, hence since A is U-connected, there would exist a member E of U such that $E \cap B$ and $E \cap (A \vdash B)$ were both nonempty. Let E be a member of U such that $E \cap B$ and $E \cap (A \vdash B)$ are both nonempty, and let k be any member of $E \cap B$ and let l be any member of $E \cap (A \vdash B)$. Now by the definition of B, there exists a finite integer $n \geq 0$ and a map M such that $\mathcal{D}(M)$ is the set of all the integers r such that $0 \leq r \leq n$ holds, and for each member r of $\mathcal{D}(M)$, M_r is a member of U, and for all r such that $0 \leq r$ and $r \leq (n-1)$ both hold, $A(M_r \cap M_{r+1})$ is nonempty, and $i \in M_0$ holds and $k \in M_n$ holds. Let n be such a finite integer, let

M be such a map, and let $N \equiv M \cup \{(n+1, E)\}$. Then N is a map such that $\mathcal{D}(N)$ is the set of all the integers r such that $0 \leq r \leq (n+1)$ holds, and for every member r of $\mathcal{D}(N)$, N_r is a member of U, and for all r such that $0 \leq r$ and $r \leq n$ both hold, $A \cap (N_r \cap N_{r+1})$ is nonempty, (for $N_n \cap N_{n+1}$ has k as a member), and $i \in N_0$ holds and $l \in N_{n+1}$ holds. Hence $l \in B$ holds by the definition of B, and this contradicts the assumption that $l \in (A \vdash B)$ holds. Hence *no* member of U intersects both B and $(A \vdash B)$, hence the assumption that $(A \vdash B)$ is nonempty contradicts the assumption that A is U-connected.

Lemma 28. Let U be a set such that every member of U is a set, and let A be a nonempty U-connected set.

For any ordered pair (i, X) of a member i of A and a subset X of U, let $\uparrow (i, X)$ denote the set whose members are all the members j of A such that if E is any member of X, and $\{B, C\}$ is any partition of A into two nonempty parts such that $B \cap E \neq \emptyset$ holds, $C \cap E \neq \emptyset$ holds, and E is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C, then j is a member of the *same* member of $\{B, C\}$ as i, or in other words, $\mathcal{C}(\{B, C\}, j) = \mathcal{C}(\{B, C\}, i)$ holds.

Let i be any member of A.

We define a binary relation, written $\rightarrow$, among the U-keys of A as follows:

If S and T are U-keys of A, then $S \rightarrow T$ holds iff there *exists* a partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two nonempty parts B and C such that T intersects both B and C, T is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C, and S does *not* intersect the member of $\{B, C\}$ of which i is a member.

We note that this definition has the immediate consequence that $S \rightarrow S$ does *not* hold for any U-key S of A, and that the definition of the relation $\rightarrow$ depends implicitly on the member i of A.

Then the following results hold:

(i) Let S and T be any U-keys of A such that $S \rightarrow T$ holds. Then $T \rightarrow S$ does *not* hold. For $S \rightarrow T$ implies that there exists a partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two nonempty parts such that T intersects both B and C, T is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C, $i \in C$ holds, and S does *not* intersect C. Let $\{B, C\}$ be such a partition of A, and let $\{J, K\}$ be any partition of A into two parts such that S intersects both J and K, S is the *only* member of U to intersect both J and K, and $i \in K$ holds. Now S is not equal to T, for T intersects both B and C, but S does *not* intersect C.

Hence by the definition of $\{J, K\}$, T does not intersect both J and K. Now if $T \cap K$ were empty, then by Lemma 26, $C \cap K$ would be empty. But $C \cap K$ has the member i, hence $T \cap J$ must be empty. But T is a U-key of A, hence $T \cap A$ is nonempty, hence T certainly intersects at least one of J and K, hence T intersects K, hence T intersects the member of $\{J, K\}$ of which i is a member. And this is true for *every* partition $\{J, K\}$ of A into two parts such that S intersects both parts and S is the *only* member of U to intersect both parts. Hence $T \to S$ does *not* hold.

(ii) Let R, S and T be any U-keys of A such that $R \to S$ holds and $S \to T$ holds. Then $R \to T$ holds. For $R \to S$ implies there exists a partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two nonempty parts such that $i \in C$ holds, S intersects both B and C, S is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C, and R does *not* intersect C. Let $\{B, C\}$ be such a partition of A. And $S \to T$ implies there exists a partition $\{J, K\}$ of A into two nonempty parts such that $i \in K$ holds, T intersects both J and K, T is the *only* member of U to intersect both J and K, and S does *not* intersect K. Let $\{J, K\}$ be such a partition of A. Now T intersects K and S does *not* intersect K, hence T is not equal to S, hence since S is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C, T does *not* intersect both B and C. Now if $T \cap C$ was empty, then by Lemma 26, $C \cap K$ would be empty, but $C \cap K$ has the member i, hence $T \cap C$ cannot be empty, hence $T \cap B$ is empty, hence by Lemma 26, $B \cap K$ is empty. Now every member of B is either a member of J or a member of K, and $B \cap K$ is empty hence no member of B is a member of K, hence every member of B is a member of J, hence $B \subseteq J$ holds. Now R is a U-key of A such that R does not intersect C, hence R *does* intersect B, and $B \subseteq J$ holds, hence R intersects J. And $R \to S$ and $S \to T$ both hold, hence by (i) above, R is *not* equal to T, hence R does *not* intersect both J and K, hence since R intersects J, R does *not* intersect K. Hence $\{J, K\}$ is a partition of A into two nonempty parts such that $i \in K$ holds, T intersects both J and K, T is the *only* member of U to intersect both J and K, and R does *not* intersect K. Hence $R \to T$ holds.

(iii) Let k be any member of A such that $k \neq i$ holds, let S be any U-key of A such that there exists a partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two parts such that $k \in B$ holds, $i \in C$ holds, S intersects both B and C, and S is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C, and let T be any U-key of A such that there exists a partition $\{J, K\}$ of A

into two parts such that $k \in J$ holds, $i \in K$ holds, T intersects both J and K, and T is the *only* member of U to intersect both J and K. Then either $S = T$ holds or $S \rightarrow T$ holds or $T \rightarrow S$ holds. For suppose $S \neq T$ holds, and let $\{B, C\}$ and $\{J, K\}$ be partitions of A with the properties just specified. Then one of $B \cap T$ and $C \cap T$ is empty, and one of $J \cap S$ and $K \cap S$ is empty. Now $C \cap K$ has the member i so is nonempty, hence by Lemma 26, $C \cap T$ and $K \cap S$ cannot both be empty, and $B \cap J$ has the member k so is nonempty, hence by Lemma 26, $B \cap T$ and $J \cap S$ cannot both be empty, hence either $B \cap T$ and $K \cap S$ are both empty, or $C \cap T$ and $J \cap S$ are both empty. And if $K \cap S$ is empty then $S \rightarrow T$ holds, while if $C \cap T$ is empty, then $T \rightarrow S$ holds.

(iv) Let k be any member of A such that $k \neq i$ holds, let S be any U-key of A such that there exists a partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two parts such that $k \in B$ holds, $i \in C$ holds, S intersects both B and C, and S is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C, and let T be any U-key of A such that $S \rightarrow T$ holds. Then there exists a partition $\{J, K\}$ of A such that $k \in J$ holds, $i \in K$ holds, T intersects both J and K, and T is the *only* member of U to intersect both J and K. For let $\{B, C\}$ be a partition of A with the properties just specified. Now $S \rightarrow T$ implies that there exists a partition $\{J, K\}$ of A into two parts such that $i \in K$ holds, T intersects both J and K, T is the *only* member of U to intersect both J and K, and S does *not* intersect K. Let $\{J, K\}$ be such a partition of A. Now T intersects K and S does not intersect K, hence T is not equal to S, hence one of $B \cap T$ and $C \cap T$ is empty. And $C \cap K$ has the member i hence is nonempty, hence by Lemma 26, $C \cap T$ cannot be empty, hence $B \cap T$ is empty, hence by Lemma 26, $B \cap K$ is empty, hence since k is a member of B, k is *not* a member of K, hence k is a member of J.

(v) Let k be any member of A such that $k \neq i$ holds, let S be any U-key of A such that there exists a partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two parts such that $k \in B$ holds, $i \in C$ holds, S intersects both B and C, and S is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C, let n be any finite integer ≥ 0, and let M be any map such that $\mathcal{D}(M)$ is the set of all the integers r such that $0 \leq r \leq n$ holds, and for every member r of $\mathcal{D}(M)$, M_r is a member of U, and for all r such that $0 \leq r$ and $r \leq (n-1)$ both hold, $A \cap (M_r \cap M_{r+1})$ is nonempty, and $i \in M_0$ holds and $k \in M_n$ holds. Then $S \in \mathcal{R}(M)$ holds. For S is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C, hence if $S \in \mathcal{R}(M)$ does *not* hold, then *no* member of $\mathcal{R}\,(M)$ intersects both B and C. Suppose now that S is *not* a member of $\mathcal{R}\,(M)$, so *no* member of $\mathcal{R}\,(M)$ intersects both B and C. Then for any r such that $0 \leq r$ and $r \leq (n-1)$ both hold, $A\,(M_r \cap M_{r+1})$ is nonempty, hence if M_r intersects C but not B, then M_{r+1} also intersects C but not B. But M_0 intersects C but not B, hence by induction, M_n intersects C but not B, and this contradicts the fact that k is a member of B.

(vi) Let X be any subset of U such that every member of X is a U-key of A, and let k be any member of A such that there *exists* a member S of X and a partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two parts such that $k \in B$ holds, $i \in C$ holds, S intersects both B and C, and S is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C. Then there exists a unique member T of X with the properties that:

(a) there exists a partition $\{J, K\}$ of A into two parts such that $k \in J$ holds, $i \in K$ holds, T intersects both J and K, and T is the *only* member of U to intersect both J and K, and

(b) there is *no* member R of X such that $T \rightarrow R$ holds.

Proof. Let Y be the set whose members are all the members S of X such that there exists a partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two parts such that $k \in B$ holds, $i \in C$ holds, S intersects both B and C, and S is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C. Now by assumption there *exists* a member S of X and a partition $\{B, C\}$ of A such that $k \in B$ holds, $i \in C$ holds, S intersects both B and C, and S is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C. Hence Y is nonempty.

Now let S be any member of Y and let R be any member of X such that $S \rightarrow R$ holds. Then by (iv) above, there exists a partition $\{J, K\}$ of A into two parts such that $k \in J$ holds, $i \in K$ holds, R intersects both J and K, and R is the *only* member of U to intersect both J and K. Hence R is a member of Y.

Now by Lemma 27, there exists a finite integer $n \geq 0$ and a map M such that $\mathcal{D}\,(M)$ is the set of all the integers r such that $0 \leq r \leq n$ holds, and for every member r of $\mathcal{D}\,(M)$, M_r is a member of U, and for all r such that $0 \leq r$ and $r \leq (n-1)$ both hold, $A \cap (M_r \cap M_{r+1})$ is nonempty, and $i \in M_0$ holds and $k \in M_n$ holds. Let n be such a finite integer and let M be such a map. Then by (v) above, every member of Y is a member of $\mathcal{R}\,(M)$. Hence Y is a finite set.

Now by (i), (ii), and (iii) above, the set Y is totally ordered by the relation $\rightarrow$, hence since Y is a finite set, there exists a unique member T of Y such that there is no member R of Y such that $T \to R$ holds. Let T be this unique member of Y.

Now by the definition of Y, T is a member of X such that there exists a partition $\{J, K\}$ of A into two parts such that $k \in J$ holds, $i \in K$ holds, T intersects both J and K, and T is the *only* member of U to intersect both J and K. And as noted above, if R is any member of X such that $T \to R$ holds, then R is a member of Y, hence since there is no member R of Y such that $T \to R$ holds, there is no member R of X such that $T \to R$ holds.

And finally, if S is any member of X such that there exists a partition $\{J, K\}$ of A into two parts such that $k \in J$ holds, $i \in K$ holds, S intersects both J and K, and S is the *only* member of U to intersect both J and K, and there is *no* member R of X such that $S \to R$ holds, then S is a member of Y, hence S is equal to T.

(vii) Let X be any subset of U such that every member of X is a U-key of A, and let Z be the subset of X whose members are all the members T of X such that there is *no* member R of X such that $T \to R$ holds. Then $\uparrow (i, X) = \uparrow (i, Z)$ holds. For $\uparrow (i, X) \subseteq \uparrow (i, Z)$ certainly holds. Now let k be any member of $(A \vdash \uparrow (i, X))$. Then there exists a member S of X and a partition $\{B, C\}$ of A such that $k \in B$ holds, $i \in C$ holds, S intersects both B and C, and S is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C. Then by (vi) above there exists a member T of X such that there exists a partition $\{J, K\}$ of A into two parts such that $k \in J$ holds, $i \in K$ holds, T intersects both J and K, and T is the *only* member of U to intersect both J and K, and such that there is *no* member R of X such that $T \to R$ holds. And this T is a member of Z, hence k is *not* a member of $\uparrow (i, Z)$.

(viii) Let E be any U-key of A. Then $\{\uparrow (i, \{E\}), (A \vdash \uparrow (i, \{E\}))\}$ is a partition of A into two nonempty parts such that E intersects both parts, and E is the *only* member of U to intersect both parts. For by definition, $\uparrow (i, \{E\})$ is the set whose members are all the members j of A such that for every partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two parts such that E intersects both B and C, and E is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C, j is a member of the *same* member of $\{B, C\}$ as i is. Hence i is a member of $\uparrow (i, \{E\})$, hence $\uparrow (i, \{E\})$ is nonempty. And since E is a U-key of A, there *exists* a partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two nonempty parts such that E intersects both B and C, and E is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C, hence since every member of the member of $\{B, C\}$ of which i is *not* a member, is a member of $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{E\}))$, $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{E\}))$ is nonempty. Hence $\{\uparrow (i, \{E\}), (A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{E\}))\}$ is a partition of A into two nonempty parts hence, since A is U-connected, there *exists* a member R of U such that R intersects both $\uparrow (i, \{E\})$ and $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{E\}))$. Let R be any member of U such that R intersects both $\uparrow (i, \{E\})$ and $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{E\}))$. Now if $\{B, C\}$ is any partition of A such that $i \in C$ holds, E intersects both B and C, and E is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C, then $\uparrow (i, \{E\}) \subseteq C$ holds, hence R intersects C, hence if R is not equal to E, then $(A \cap R) \subseteq C$ holds. And this is true for *every* partition $\{B, C\}$ of A such that $i \in C$ holds, E intersects both B and C, and E is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C, hence if $R \neq E$ holds, and j is any member of $(A \cap R)$, then for *every* partition $\{B, C\}$ of A such that E intersects both B and C, and E is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C, j is a member of the *same* member of $\{B, C\}$ as i is, hence by the definition of $\uparrow (i, \{E\})$, $j \in\uparrow (i, \{E\})$ holds. Hence if $R \neq E$ holds then $(A \cap R) \subseteq\uparrow (i, \{E\})$ holds, which contradicts the fact that $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{E\})) \cap R$ is nonempty. Hence $R = E$ holds and E is the *only* member of U to intersect both $\uparrow (i, \{E\})$ and $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{E\}))$.

(ix) Let E be any U-key of A. Then E is *not* a U-key of $\uparrow (i, \{E\})$. For if there exists a partition $\{B, C\}$ of $\uparrow (i, \{E\})$ into two parts such that $i \in C$ holds, E intersects both B and C, and E is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C, let $\{B, C\}$ be such a partition of $\uparrow (i, \{E\})$. Then $\{(B \cup (A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{E\}))), C\}$ is a partition of A into two nonempty parts such that $i \in C$ holds, E intersects both parts, and E is the *only* member of U to intersect both parts, for by assumption E is the only member of U to intersect both B and C, and by (viii) above, together with the fact that $C \subseteq\uparrow (i, \{E\})$ holds, E is the *only* member of U to intersect both C and $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{E\}))$. Hence by the definition of $\uparrow (i, \{E\})$, no member of B could be a member of $\uparrow (i, \{E\})$, in contradiction with the assumption that B is a nonempty subset of $\uparrow (i, \{E\})$.

(x) Let X be any subset of U such that every member of X is a U-key of A, and let T be any member of X such that there is *no* member R of X such that $T \rightarrow R$ holds. Then $T \cap \uparrow (i, X)$ is nonempty, and $(T \cap \uparrow (i, \{T\})) \subseteq\uparrow (i, X)$ holds. For by (viii) above, $T \cap \uparrow (i, \{T\})$ is nonempty. Let j be any member of $T \cap \uparrow (i, \{T\})$. *Suppose* $j \in (A \vdash\uparrow (i, X))$ holds. Then there exists a member E of X and a partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two parts such that $j \in B$ holds, $i \in C$ holds, E intersects both B and C, and E is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C. Let E be such a member of X and $\{B, C\}$ be such a partition of A. Suppose first $E \neq T$. Then T only intersects *one* of B and C. And $j \in B$ implies $B \cap T \neq \emptyset$ hence $C \cap T = \emptyset$, hence $T \to E$ holds, but by assumption $T \to R$ does not hold for *any* member R of X. Hence $E = T$ must hold. But $j \in T \cap \uparrow (i, \{T\})$ implies that j is a member of the *same* member of $\{B, C\}$ as i for *all* partitions $\{B, C\}$ of A into two parts such that T intersects both B and C, and T is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C. Hence there is *no* member E of X such such that there exists a partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two parts such that $j \in B$ holds, $i \in C$ holds, E intersects both B and C, and E is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C. Hence $j \in \uparrow (i, X)$ holds, and since this is true for *all* members j of $T \cap \uparrow (i, \{T\})$, $(T \cap \uparrow (i, \{T\})) \subseteq \uparrow (i, X)$ holds. And finally, since every member of the nonempty set $(T \cap \uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ is a member of T, $T \cap \uparrow (i, X)$ is nonempty.

(xi) Let X be any subset of U such that every member of X is a U-key of A, and let Z be the subset of X whose members are all the members T of X such that there is *no* member R of X such that $T \to R$ holds. Then A is equal to the disjoint union of $\uparrow (i, X) = \uparrow (i, Z)$, and the sets $(A \vdash \uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ for all the members T of Z, (or in other words, $\uparrow (i, X)$ and the sets $(A \vdash \uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ for all the members T of Z, are all distinct from one another, and the set whose members are all these sets, is a partition of A). For let S and T be any two distinct members of Z, and if $(A \vdash \uparrow (i, \{S\})) \cap (A \vdash \uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ is nonempty let k be any member of $(A \vdash \uparrow (i, \{S\})) \cap (A \vdash \uparrow (i, \{T\}))$. Then by (iii) above either $S \to T$ holds or $T \to S$ holds, contradicting the assumption that S and T are distinct members of Z. Hence $(A \vdash \uparrow (i, \{S\})) \cap (A \vdash \uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ is empty. Now by definition, $\uparrow (i, Z)$ is $\bigcap_{T \in Z} \uparrow (i, \{T\})$. Hence if k is a member of $(A \vdash \uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ for some member T of Z then k is *not* a member of $\uparrow (i, Z)$. Hence all these sets are mutually disjoint. Now let k be any member of A. Suppose first there *exists* a member T of Z such that there exists a partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two parts such that $k \in B$ holds, $i \in C$ holds, T intersects both B and C, and T is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C. Then k is not a member of $\uparrow (i, \{T\})$ hence $k \in (A \vdash \uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ holds. Now suppose that for *every* member T of Z, and *every* partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two parts such that T intersects both B and C, and T is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C, k and i are members of the *same* member of $\{B, C\}$. Then $k \in \uparrow (i, Z)$ holds.

(xii) Let X be any subset of U such that every member of X is a U-key of A, let Z be the subset of X whose members are all the members E of X such that there is *no* member R of X such that $E \rightarrow R$ holds, and let S and T be any two distinct members of Z. Then *no* member of U intersects both $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{S\}))$ and $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{T\}))$. For $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{S\})) \cap (A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{T\})) = \emptyset$ holds by (xi) above, and it immediately follows from this that $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{S\})) \subseteq\uparrow (i, \{T\})$ holds and $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{T\})) \subseteq\uparrow (i, \{S\})$ holds. And by (viii) above, S is the *only* member of U to intersect both $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{S\}))$ and $\uparrow (i, \{S\})$, and T is the *only* member of U to intersect both $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ and $\uparrow (i, \{T\})$. Hence if a member R of U intersected both $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{S\}))$ and $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ then R would have to be equal to both S and T, which is impossible since by assumption $S \neq T$.

(xiii) Let X be any subset of U such that every member of X is a U-key of A. Then *no* member of X is a U-key of $\uparrow (i, X)$. For if there exists a member S of X such that S is a U-key of $\uparrow (i, X)$, let S be such a member of X. Now if there is any member E of X such that $S \rightarrow E$ holds, let E be such a member of X. Then there exists a partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two parts such that $i \in C$ holds, E intersects both B and C, E is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C, and S does *not* intersect C. Hence *no* member of S is a member of $\uparrow (i, X)$, hence $S \cap \uparrow (i, X) = \emptyset$, hence S is *not* a U-key of $\uparrow (i, X)$, contrary to assumption. Hence there is *no* member E of X such that $S \rightarrow E$ holds, hence by (x) above, S *does* intersect $\uparrow (i, X)$. Now by (ix) above, S is *not* a U-key of $\uparrow (i, \{S\})$. Let Z be the set whose members are all the members T of X such that there is *no* member E of X such that $T \rightarrow E$ holds. Then as just shown, S is a member of Z. Hence by (xi) above, $\uparrow (i, \{S\})$ is equal to the disjoint union of $\uparrow (i, Z) =\uparrow (i, X)$, and all the sets $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ for the members T of Z such that $T \neq S$. Now *suppose* $\{B, C\}$ is a partition of $\uparrow (i, X) =\uparrow (i, Z)$ into two parts such that S intersects both B and C, and S is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C. Then since by (x) above, every member of Z does intersect $\uparrow (i, X)$, every member of Z other than S intersects exactly *one* of B and C. Let J be the set equal to the disjoint union of B, and the sets $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ for all the members T of Z such that $T \neq S$ and $T \cap B \neq \emptyset$ both hold, and let K be the set equal to the disjoint union of C, and the sets $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{R\}))$ for all the members R of Z such that $R \neq S$ and $R \cap C \neq \emptyset$ both hold. Then $\{J, K\}$ is a partition of $\uparrow (i, \{S\})$ into two nonempty parts such that S intersects both parts. Now suppose some member E of

U, such that $E \neq S$ holds, intersects both J and K. Then E does not intersect both B and C, since by assumption S is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C. And by (xii) above, E cannot intersect both $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ and $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{R\}))$ for any two distinct members T and R of Z. Hence either E intersects both B and a set $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{R\}))$, where R is a member of Z such that $R \neq S$ and $R \cap C \neq \emptyset$ both hold, or else E intersects both C and a set $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{T\}))$, where T is a member of Z such that $T \neq S$ and $T \cap B \neq \emptyset$ both hold. But in the first case E must also intersect $\uparrow (i, \{R\})$, since B is a subset of $\uparrow (i, \{R\})$, hence by (viii) above, $E = R$ holds, hence E is a member of Z different from S, hence by assumption E does *not* intersect both B and C, but since E is equal to R this contradicts the assumptions that $E \cap B$ and $R \cap C$ are both nonempty. And in the second case E must also intersect $\uparrow (i, \{T\})$, since C is a subset of $\uparrow (i, \{T\})$, hence by (viii) above, $E = T$ holds, hence E is a member of Z different from S, hence by assumption E does not intersect both B and C, but since E is equal to T this contradicts the assumptions that $E \cap C$ and $T \cap B$ are both nonempty. Hence there is *no* member E of U such that $E \neq S$ holds and E intersects both J and K, hence the assumption that S is a U-key of $\uparrow (i, X)$ implies that S is a U-key of $\uparrow (i, \{S\})$, in contradiction with (ix) above.

(xiv) Let X be any subset of U such that every member of X is a U-key of A, and let $\{B, C\}$ be any partition of $\uparrow (i, X)$ into two parts such that *no* member of X intersects both parts. Let Z be the subset of X whose members are all the members S of X such that there is *no* member R of X such that $S \rightarrow R$ holds. Let J be the set equal to the disjoint union of B, and the sets $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ for all the members T of Z such that $B \cap T \neq \emptyset$ holds, and let K be the set equal to the disjoint union of C, and the sets $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{R\}))$ for all the members R of Z such that $C \cap R \neq \emptyset$ holds. Then $\{J, K\}$ is a partition of A, and if E is *any* member of U such that E intersects both J and K, then E intersects both B and C. For (x) and (xi) above, together with the assumption that *no* member of X intersects both B and C, hence that *no* member of Z intersects both B and C, imply directly that $\{J, K\}$ is a partition of A. Now let E be any member of U such that E intersects both J and K. Then since by (xii) above, E does not intersect both $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ and $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{R\}))$ for any two distinct members T and R of Z, either E intersects both B and C, or E intersects both B and the set $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{R\}))$, where R is some member of Z such that $R \cap C$ is nonempty, or else E intersects both C and the set $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{T\}))$, where T is some member of Z

such that $T \cap B$ is nonempty. But if E intersects both B and the set $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{R\}))$, where R is a member of Z, then E also intersects $\uparrow (i, \{R\})$ since $B \subseteq\uparrow (i, \{R\})$ holds, hence by (viii) above E is equal to R, hence R intersects B, hence since by assumption no member of Z intersects both B and C, R does *not* intersect C. And if E intersects both C and the set $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{T\}))$, where T is a member of Z, then E also intersects $\uparrow (i, \{T\})$ since $C \subseteq\uparrow (i, \{T\})$ holds, hence by (viii) above E is equal to T, hence T intersects C, hence since by assumption no member of Z intersects both B and C, T does *not* intersect B. Hence E must intersect both B and C.

(xv) Let X be any subset of U such that every member of X is a U-key of A. Then $\uparrow (i, X)$ is U-connected. For if there exists a partition $\{B, C\}$ of $\uparrow (i, X)$ into two nonempty parts such that *no* member of U intersects both parts, let $\{B, C\}$ be such a partition of $\uparrow (i, X)$. Then no member of X intersects both B and C. Let J and K be the sets constructed from B and C as described in (xiv) above. Then by (xiv) above, $\{J, K\}$ is a partition of A into two nonempty parts such that *no* member of U intersects both parts, which is impossible since A is U-connected.

(xvi) Let X be any subset of U such that every member of X is a U-key of A, and let E be any member of U. Then E is a U-key of $\uparrow (i, X)$ ifif E is a U-key of A such that E intersects $\uparrow (i, X)$ and E is *not* a member of X. For suppose first that E is a U-key of $\uparrow (i, X)$. Then by (xiii) above, E is *not* a member of X. Let $\{B, C\}$ be a partition of $\uparrow (i, X)$ into two parts such that E intersects both B and C, and E is the *only* member of U to intersect both B and C. Then no member of X intersects both B and C. Let J and K be the sets constructed from B and C as described in (xiv) above. Then by (xiv) above, $\{J, K\}$ is a partition of A into two parts such that E intersects both parts and E is the *only* member of U to intersect both parts. Hence E is a U-key of A. And furthermore, E certainly intersects $\uparrow (i, X)$ and, as already noted, E is *not* a member of X. Now let E be any U-key of A such that E intersects $\uparrow (i, X)$ and E is *not* a member of X. Let Z be the subset of X whose members are all the members T of X such that there is *no* member R of X such that $T \to R$ holds. Then E does not intersect $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ for *any* member T of Z, for if T was a member of Z such that E intersected $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{T\}))$, then since $\uparrow (i, X) \subseteq\uparrow (i, \{T\})$ holds, E would intersect both $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ and $\uparrow (i, \{T\})$, hence by (viii) above E would be equal to T, which contradicts the assumption that E is *not* a member of X. Hence by (xi) above, $E \cap A$ is a subset of $\uparrow (i, X) = \uparrow (i, Z)$. Now the assumption that E is a U-key of A implies that there exists a partition $\{J, K\}$ of A into two parts such that E intersects both J and K, and E is the *only* member of U to intersect both J and K. Let $\{J, K\}$ be such a partition of A. Then $J \cap E$ is nonempty. Let j be any member of $J \cap E$. Then j is a member of $E \cap A$ hence since, as just shown, every member of $E \cap A$ is a member of $\uparrow (i, X)$, j is a member of $\uparrow (i, X)$, hence $J \cap \uparrow (i, X)$ is nonempty and E intersects $(J \cap \uparrow (i, X))$. And $K \cap E$ is nonempty hence again, since every member of $E \cap A$ is a member of $\uparrow (i, X)$, hence every member of $K \cap E$ is a member of $\uparrow (i, X)$, $K \cap \uparrow (i, X)$ is nonempty and E intersects $(K \cap \uparrow (i, X))$. Hence $\{(J \cap \uparrow (i, X)), (K \cap \uparrow (i, X))\}$ is a partition of $\uparrow (i, X)$ into two nonempty parts such that E intersects both parts and E is the *only* member of U to intersect both parts. Hence E is a U-key of $\uparrow (i, X)$.

We recall from page 134 that if A is a set, U is a set such that every member of U is a set, and V is a subset of U, then a *U-firm over V component of A* is a nonempty subset B of A such that B is U-firm over V and B is *not* a strict subset of any subset of A that is U-firm over V.

Lemma 29. Let U be a set such that every member of U is a set, V be a subset of U, A be a nonempty U-connected set, i be any member of A, and B be the subset of A whose members are all the members j of A such that for every U-key E of A such that $E \notin V$ holds, and every partition $\{J, K\}$ of A into two parts such that E intersects both J and K, and E is the *only* member of U to intersect both J and K, j is a member of the *same* member of $\{J, K\}$ as i is. Then B is a U-firm over V component of A.

Proof. We define X to be the set whose members are all the U-keys E of A such that $E \notin V$ holds, and observe that the set B as defined above is then equal to the set $\uparrow (i, X)$, where the function $\uparrow (i, X)$ is defined as in Lemma 28. Hence by (xv) of Lemma 28, B is U-connected, and by (xvi) of Lemma 28, every U-key of B is a member of V. Hence B is U-firm over V.

Now let C be any subset of A such that $B \subset C$ holds. Then $C \vdash B$ is nonempty. Let j be any member of $C \vdash B$. Then by the definition of B there exists a U-key E of A such that $E \notin V$, and a partition $\{J, K\}$ of A into two parts such that $j \in J$ holds, $i \in K$ holds, E intersects both J and K, and E is the *only* member of U to intersect both J and K. Let E be such a U-key of A and $\{J, K\}$ be such a partition of A. Then j is a member of $J \cap C$ hence $J \cap C$ is nonempty, and i is a member of $K \cap C$ hence $K \cap C$ is nonempty, hence $\{(J \cap C), (K \cap C)\}$ is a partition of C into two nonempty parts. And if E intersects both $J \cap C$ and $K \cap C$, then E is a U-key of C such that $C \notin V$, hence C is not U-firm over V, while if E does *not* intersect both $J \cap C$ and $K \cap C$, then *no* member of U intersects both $J \cap C$ and $K \cap C$, hence C is not U-connected hence again C is not U-firm over V. Hence B is a U-firm over V subset of A such that $i \in B$ holds, and B is not a strict subset of any U-firm over V subset of A, hence B is a U-firm over V component of A.

Lemma 30. Let U be a set such that every member of U is a set, V be a subset of U, and B and C be any two distinct nonempty U-firm over V sets such that $B \cap C$ is nonempty. Then $B \cup C$ is U-firm over V.

Proof. Let $\{J, K\}$ be any partition of $B \cup C$ into two parts. Now by assumption $B \cap C$ is nonempty. Let i be a member of $B \cap C$. Then i is a member of exactly one member of $\{J, K\}$. Let M be the member of $\{J, K\}$ that has i as a member, and let N be the other member of $\{J, K\}$. Then both $B \cap M$ and $C \cap M$ are nonempty, and at least one of $B \cap N$ and $C \cap N$ is nonempty. Let W be a member of $\{B, C\}$ such that $W \cap N$ is nonempty. Then $\{(W \cap M), (W \cap N)\}$ is a partition of W into two nonempty parts hence the fact that W is U-firm over V implies that there exists a member E of U such that E intersects both $(W \cap M)$ and $(W \cap N)$, and furthermore since every U-key of W is a member of V, either $E \in V$ holds or else E is *not* the only member of U to intersect both $(W \cap M)$ and $(W \cap N)$. Now $\{(W \cap M), (W \cap N)\} = \{(W \cap J), (W \cap K)\}$ holds hence E is a member of U that intersects both J and K, and furthermore either $E \in V$ holds or else E is *not* the only member of U to intersect both J and K.

Lemma 31. Let U be a set such that every member of U is a set, V be a subset of U, and A be a nonempty U-connected set. Then the set whose members are all the U-firm over V components of A, is a partition of A.

Proof. Let F be the set whose members are all the U-firm over V components of A. Then it follows directly from the definition of a U-firm over V component of A that no member of F is empty. And it follows directly from Lemma 30 that no two distinct members of F intersect one another, for if B and C are any two distinct nonempty

U-firm over V subsets of A such that $B \cap C$ is nonempty, then by Lemma 30, $B \cup C$ is U-firm over V, hence both B and C are strict subsets of the U-firm over V subset $(B \cup C)$ of A, hence neither B nor C is a U-firm over V component of A. And furthermore, every member of F is a subset of A, hence $\mathcal{U}(F) \subseteq A$ holds, and if i is any member of A, then by Lemma 29 there *exists* a member B of F such that $i \in B$ holds, hence $A \subseteq \mathcal{U}(F)$ holds, hence $A = \mathcal{U}(F)$ holds.

Lemma 32. Let U be a set such that every member of U is a set, V be a subset of U, A be a nonempty U-connected set, and f be any member of A.

We define a binary relation, written $\rightarrow$, among the U-keys of A as follows:

If S and T are U-keys of A, then $S \rightarrow T$ holds ifif there *exists* a partition $\{J, K\}$ of A into two nonempty parts J and K such that T intersects both J and K, T is the *only* member of U to intersect both J and K, and S does *not* intersect the member of $\{J, K\}$ of which f is a member.

We note that this definition has the immediate consequence that $S \rightarrow S$ does *not* hold for any U-key S of A, and that the definition of the relation $\rightarrow$ depends implicitly on the member f of A.

Let B be any U-firm over V component of A such that f is *not* a member of B, and let Z be the set whose members are all the U-keys E of A such that $E \notin V$ and $E \cap B \neq \emptyset$ both hold.

Then there exists a *unique* member T of Z such that there exists a partition $\{J, K\}$ of A into two nonempty parts such that $B \subseteq J$ holds, $f \in K$ holds, T intersects both J and K, and T is the *only* member of U to intersect both J and K. And this unique member T of Z has the properties that $S \rightarrow T$ holds for every member S of Z different from T, $T \rightarrow S$ does *not* hold for *any* member S of Z, and if R and S are any members of Z such that $S \rightarrow R$ holds, then $R = T$ holds.

Proof. We first note that the relation $\rightarrow$ just defined is the same as the relation $\rightarrow$ defined in Lemma 28 if we choose the member i of A with respect to which the relation $\rightarrow$ was defined in Lemma 28, to be equal to f. Hence by (i) of Lemma 28, if S and T are any U-keys of A, *at most one* of $S \rightarrow T$ and $T \rightarrow S$ can hold.

Now for any ordered pair (i, X) of a member i of A and a subset X of U, let $\uparrow(i, X)$ denote, as in Lemma 28, the set whose members are all the members j of A such that if E is any member of X, and $\{J, K\}$ is any partition of A into two parts such that E

intersects both J and K, and E is the *only* member of U to intersect both J and K, then j is a member of the *same* member of $\{J, K\}$ as i is.

And let X be the set whose members are all the U-keys E of A such that E is *not* a member of V. Then if i is any member of the U-firm over V component B of A, it follows directly from Lemmas 29 and 31 that B is equal to $\uparrow (i, X)$.

And furthermore, the set Z, defined above to be the set whose members are all the U-keys E of A such that $E \notin V$ and $E \cap B \neq \emptyset$ both hold, is equal to the subset of X whose members are all the members S of X such that there is *no* member R of X such that there exists a partition $\{J, K\}$ of A into two parts such that R intersects both J and K, $B \subseteq K$ holds, R intersects both J and K, R is the *only* member of U to intersect both J and K, and S does *not* intersect K. For by definition Z is equal to the subset of X whose members are all the members E of X such that $E \cap B \neq \emptyset$. Let i be any member of B. We now use Lemma 28 with the i of Lemma 28 identified with this member i of B, (so the relation $\rightarrow$ of Lemma 28 is now *not* the same as the relation $\rightarrow$ defined above). Now it follows directly from the definition of $B = \uparrow (i, X)$ that if R is any member of X, and $\{J, K\}$ is any partition of A into two parts such that R intersects both parts, and R is the *only* member of U to intersect both parts, then every member of $B = \uparrow (i, X)$ is a member of the *same* member of $\{J, K\}$, or in other words, $B = \uparrow (i, X)$ is a *subset* of one of the two members of $\{J, K\}$. Hence by (x) of Lemma 28, if S is any member of X such that there is *no* member R of X such that there exists a partition $\{J, K\}$ of A into two parts such that R intersects both parts, R is the *only* member of U to intersect both parts, $B \subseteq K$ holds, and S does *not* intersect K, then S *does* intersect $B = \uparrow (i, X)$, hence S is a member of Z. And conversely, if S is a member of Z, then S intersects $B = \uparrow (i, X)$, hence there is *no* partition $\{J, K\}$ of A into two parts such that $B \subseteq K$ holds and S does not intersect K.

Hence by (vii) of Lemma 28, $B = \uparrow (i, X) = \uparrow (i, Z)$ holds, and by (xi) of Lemma 28, A is equal to the disjoint union of $B = \uparrow (i, X) = \uparrow (i, Z)$, and the sets $(A \vdash \uparrow (i, \{S\}))$ for all the members S of Z. Hence since f is not a member of B, there is a unique member T of Z such that $f \in (A \vdash \uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ holds. Let T be the unique member of Z such that $f \in (A \vdash \uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ holds. Now by (viii) of Lemma 28, T intersects both $(A \vdash \uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ and $\uparrow (i, \{T\})$, and T is the *only* member of U to intersect both $(A \vdash \uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ and $\uparrow (i, \{T\})$. And furthermore, it follows directly from the definition of $\uparrow (i, X) = B$ that $\uparrow (i, X) \subseteq \uparrow (i, \{T\})$ holds. Hence $\{(A \vdash \uparrow (i, \{T\})), \uparrow (i, \{T\})\}$

is a partition of A into two parts such that $f \in (A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{T\}))$ holds, $B \subseteq\uparrow (i, \{T\})$ holds, T intersects both parts, and T is the *only* member of U to intersect both parts. And if S is any member of Z different from T, then S intersects $B = \uparrow (i, X)$, hence S intersects $\uparrow (i, \{T\})$, hence S does *not* intersect $(A \vdash\uparrow (i, \{T\}))$, hence $S \rightarrow T$ holds, where the relation $\rightarrow$ is defined with reference to f as in the statement of this Lemma. And furthermore, since $S \rightarrow T$ and $T \rightarrow S$ do not *both* hold for *any* member S of Z, and $S \rightarrow S$ does not hold for *any* U-key S of A, $T \rightarrow S$ does *not* hold for *any* member S of Z. And finally, let R and S be any members of Z such that $S \rightarrow R$ holds. Then there exists a partition $\{J, K\}$ of A into two nonempty parts such that R intersects both J and K, R is the *only* member of U to intersect both J and K, f is a member of K, and S does *not* intersect K. Let $\{J, K\}$ be such a partition of A. Then $B = \uparrow (i, X)$ is either a subset of J or a subset of K, hence since S intersects B and S does *not* intersect K, B is a subset of J. Now *suppose* that $R \neq T$ holds. Then since T intersects B, T intersects J, hence $R \neq T$ implies that T does *not* intersect K. Hence $T \rightarrow R$ holds which contradicts the fact that $R \rightarrow T$ holds.

We recall from page 134 that for every ordered pair (F, H) a wood F and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathbb{P}(F, H)$ to be the set whose members are the members of $\mathcal{M}(F)$, together with any members A of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ that satisfy both the following requirements:

(i) A has at least one $(\mathcal{M}(F) \cup H)$-key E such that $E \notin \mathcal{M}(F)$ holds

(ii) if B is any member of F such that $B \subset A$ holds, then B is a subset of an $(\mathcal{M}(F) \cup H)$-firm over $\mathcal{M}(F)$ component of A.

And we recall from page 135 that for any ordered pair (V, H) of a partition V such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathcal{V}(V, H)$ to be the set whose members are all the woods F of V such that every member A of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V.

Lemma 33. Let V be any partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, and let H be any set such that every member of H is a set. Then $\mathcal{V}(V, H)$ is the set whose members are all the members F of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$ such that $\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{P}(F, H)) = \emptyset$ holds.

Proof. We note first that if every member of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V, then $\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{P}(F, H)) = \emptyset$ certainly holds. Hence to complete the proof it is sufficient to prove that if $\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{P}(F, H)) = \emptyset$ holds then every member of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V.

Let F be any member of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$ such that $\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{P}(F, H)) = \emptyset$ holds.

We first note that if A is any member of F such that there is *no* member B of F such that $B \subset A$ holds, then A is a member of V, hence A is *certainly* $(V \cup H)$-firm over V.

We shall next show that if A is any member of F such that every member B of F such that $B \subset A$ holds, is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V, then A is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V.

Suppose A is a member of F such that every member B of F such that $B \subset A$ holds, is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V, and A is *not* $(V \cup H)$-firm over V. Then A is *not* a member of $V = \mathcal{M}(F)$, hence $A \in \mathbb{B}(F)$ holds, and A has at least one $(V \cup H)$-key E such that $E \notin V$ holds. Let B be any member of F such that $B \subset A$ holds. Then by assumption, B is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V. Now B is a member of F, hence B is nonempty, and by Lemma 31, the set whose members are all the $(V \cup H)$-firm over V components of A, is a partition of A. Let i be a member of B, and let C be the unique $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A of which i is a member. Then $B \cap C$ has the member i hence is nonempty, hence by Lemma 30, $B \cup C$ is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V, hence the fact that C is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V *component* of A implies that $B \subseteq C$ holds. Hence A is a member of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ such that A has at least one $(V \cup H)$-key E such that $E \notin V$ holds, and such that if B is any member of F such that $B \subset A$ holds, then B is a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A. Hence A is a member of $\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{P}(F, H))$, in contradiction with the assumption that $\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{P}(F, H)) = \emptyset$ holds.

Hence, as stated, if A is any member of F such that every member B of F such that $B \subset A$ holds, is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V, then A is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V.

Now for each member A of F, let n_A denote the number of members B of F such that $B \subset A$ holds. Then $n_A \geq 0$ holds, and if $n_A = 0$ holds then A is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V.

Now let m be any integer ≥ 0 and suppose that every member B of F such that $n_B \leq m$ holds is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V. Then every member A of F such that $n_A \leq (m + 1)$ holds is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V. For if $n_A \leq (m + 1)$ holds, then every member B of F such that $B \subset A$ holds satisfies $n_B \leq m$ hence is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V, and as just shown this implies that A is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V.

Hence, by induction, every member A of F is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V.

We recall from page 134 that if H is a set such that every member of H is a set, and F is a wood, then we say that F is H-principal ifif every member A of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ is

$(\mathcal{M}(F) \cup H)$-connected, every member A of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ has at least one $(\mathcal{M}(F) \cup H)$-key E such that $E \notin \mathcal{M}(F)$ holds, and if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ and B is any member of F such that $B \subset A$ holds, then B is a subset of an $(\mathcal{M}(F) \cup H)$-firm over $\mathcal{M}(F)$ component of A.

And we recall from page 135 that for any ordered pair (V, H) of a partition V such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathcal{W}(V, H)$ to be the set whose members are all the H-principal woods of V.

And we also recall from page 135 that for any ordered pair (G, H) such that H is a set such that every member of H is a set, and G is an H-principal wood, we define $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$ to be the set whose members are all the members F of $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M}(G), H)$ such that $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}(F, H)$ holds, and we note that $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$ is the set whose members are all the members F of $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M}(G), H)$ such that $G \subseteq F$ holds, and if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ and B is any member of F such that $B \subset A$ holds, then B is a subset of an $(\mathcal{M}(F) \cup H)$-firm over $\mathcal{M}(F)$ component of A.

Lemma 34. Let V be any partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, let H be a set such that every member of H is a set, and let $\mathcal{J}$ be a map such that $\mathcal{G}(V, H) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{J})$ holds and $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{J}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ holds. Then the following identity holds:

$$\sum_{F \in \mathcal{V}(V,H)} \mathcal{J}_F = \sum_{G \in \mathcal{W}(V,H)} (-1)^{\#(\mathbb{B}(G))} \sum_{F \in \mathbb{O}(G,H)} \mathcal{J}_F.$$

Proof. We first note that if G is any member of $\mathcal{W}(V, H)$ and F is any member of $\mathbb{K}(V, G)$, (or in other words, if F is any wood of V such that $F \subseteq G$ holds), then it follows directly from the definition of a principal wood of V that $F \in \mathcal{W}(V, H)$ holds.

Now let F be any member of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$. We calculate the coefficient of F in each side of the above equation.

Now by Lemma 33, the coefficient of F in the left-hand side is 1 if $\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{P}(F, H)) = \emptyset$ holds, and 0 otherwise.

In the right-hand side we calculate the coefficient of F in terms of $\#(\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{P}(F, H)))$. Now F is a member of $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$ for all members G of $\mathcal{W}(V, H)$ such that $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}(F, H)$ holds, and for no member G of $\mathcal{W}(V, H)$ such that G is *not* a subset of $\mathbb{P}(F, H)$, hence the coefficient of F in the right-hand side is equal to the sum of $(-1)^{\#(\mathbb{B}(G))}$ over all members G of $\mathcal{W}(V, H)$ such that $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}(F, H)$ holds. But $\mathbb{P}(F, H)$ is a principal wood of V hence, as noted above, *every* wood G of V such that $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}(F,H)$ holds is a member of $\mathcal{W}(V,H)$, hence the coefficient of F in the right-hand side is equal to the sum of $(-1)^{\#(\mathbb{B}(G))}$ over all members G of $\mathbb{K}(V,\mathbb{P}(F,H))$, which is equal to 1 if $\#(\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{P}(F,H))) = 0$ holds, and equal to 0 otherwise.

Lemma 35. Let V be any partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, let H be any set such that every member of H is a set and $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is $(V \cup H)$-connected, let G be any member of $\mathcal{W}(V,H)$, and let Y be the set whose members are all the $(V \cup H)$-firm over V components of the members of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, together with the set $\mathcal{U}(V)$.

Then the following results hold:

(i) Let B be any member of $(Y \vdash (V \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}))$. Then $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, B is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$, and moreover $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is the *only* member A of G such that B is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A. For $B \neq \mathcal{U}(V)$ holds hence by the definition of Y there *exists* a member A of G such that B is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A, hence in particular there *exists* a member A of G such that $B \subseteq A$ holds, hence by definition $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is the *smallest* member A of G such that $B \subseteq A$ holds, and moreover, since B is not a member of V, $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G) = (G \vdash V)$. Now let A be any member of G such that B is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A. Then A is a member of G such that $B \subseteq A$ holds, hence $\mathcal{Y}(G,B) \subseteq A$ holds, hence A is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$. Now if $\mathcal{Y}(G,B) \subset A$ held, then by the definition of an H-principal wood of V, $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ would be a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A, hence since $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, hence by the definition of an H-principal wood of V, $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is *not* $(V \cup H)$-firm over V, hence B is a *strict* subset of $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$, B could *not* be a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A. Hence $\mathcal{Y}(G,B) \subset A$ cannot hold, hence $\mathcal{Y}(G,B) = A$ holds.

(ii) $Y \subseteq \Xi(V)$ holds, or in other words, every member B of Y is a nonempty subset of $\mathcal{U}(V)$ such that B neither overlaps any member of V nor is a strict subset of any member of V. For every member of Y is certainly a nonempty subset of $\mathcal{U}(V)$, and moreover V is a subset of $\Xi(V)$ and $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is a member of $\Xi(V)$. Now let B be any member of $(Y \vdash (V \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}))$. Then by (i) above, $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and B is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$. Let i be any member of B. Then since $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is $(V \cup H)$-connected, it follows directly from Lemmas 29 and 31 that B is equal to the set whose members are all the members j of $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ such that for every $(V \cup H)$-key E of $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ such that $E \notin V$ holds, and every partition $\{J, K\}$ of $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ into two parts such that E intersects both J and K, and E is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both J and K, j is a member of the *same* member of $\{J, K\}$ as i is. Let C be any member of V and let j and k be any members of C. Then if $\{J, K\}$ is any partition of $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ into two nonempty parts such that some member E of $(V \cup H)$ such that $E \notin V$ holds is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both parts, j and k must be members of the *same* member of $\{J, K\}$, since otherwise the member C of V would intersect both parts. Hence j is a member of B iff k is a member of B, hence either *every* member of C is a member of B or *no* member of C is a member of B, hence either $C \subseteq B$ holds or $C \cap B = \emptyset$ holds.

(iii) The set $G \cup Y$ is a wood of V. For G is a wood of V, and by (ii) above, every member of Y is a member of $\Xi(V)$, hence $G \cup Y$ will be a wood of V provided that no member of Y overlaps any member of $G \cup Y$. Now certainly no member of V overlaps any member of $G \cup Y$, and $\mathcal{U}(V)$ overlaps no member of $G \cup Y$. Now let B be any member of $(Y \vdash (V \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}))$. Then by (i) above, $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and B is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$. Let C be any member of $G \cup Y$. Then C is either equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$ or else is a member of G or else is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of some member of G. Now if C is equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$ then $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \subseteq C$ holds, and if C is a member of G then either $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \cap C = \emptyset$ holds or $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \subseteq C$ holds or $C \subset \mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ holds. Now suppose that C is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of a member A of G. Then either $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \cap A = \emptyset$ holds or $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \subseteq A$ holds or $A \subset \mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ holds, and if $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \cap A = \emptyset$ holds then $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \cap C = \emptyset$ holds and if $A \subset \mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ holds then $C \subset \mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ holds. Suppose now that $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \subseteq A$ holds. Then either $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) = A$ holds, in which case $C \subseteq \mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ holds, (hence either $C = \mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ holds, hence $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \subseteq C$ holds, or else $C \subset \mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ holds), or else $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \subset A$ holds. Suppose now that $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \subset A$ holds. Then by the definition of an H-principal wood of V, $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ is a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A, hence since, by Lemma 31, the distinct $(V \cup H)$-firm over V components of A do not intersect one another, either $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \cap C = \emptyset$ holds or $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \subseteq C$ holds. Hence in every case, either $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \cap C = \emptyset$ holds or $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \subseteq C$ holds or $C \subset \mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ holds. And if $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \cap C = \emptyset$ holds then $B \cap C = \emptyset$ holds, and if $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \subseteq C$ holds then $B \subseteq C$ holds, while if $C \subset \mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ holds then C is certainly not equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$, hence C is either a member of G or else is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of some member of G, and if C is a member of G then by the definition of an H-principal wood of V, C is a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$, hence either $B \cap C = \emptyset$ holds or $C \subseteq B$ holds, since B is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$, and if C is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of a member A of G, then either $A = \mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ holds or $A \subset \mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ holds, (since A does not overlap $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$, $A \cap \mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ has the nonempty subset C, and if $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \subset A$ held then by the definition of an H-principal wood of V, $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ would be a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A, hence $C \subset \mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ implies that C could *not* be equal to a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A), and if $A = \mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ holds, then both B and C are $(V \cup H)$-firm over V components of $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$, hence either $B = C$ holds or $B \cap C = \emptyset$ holds, and if $A \subset \mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ holds, then by the definition of an H-principal wood of V, A is a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$, hence either $B \cap C = \emptyset$ holds or $C \subseteq B$ holds, since B is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$.

(iv) Let B and C be any two distinct members of $(Y \vdash G)$. Then $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, B)) \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, C)) = \emptyset$ holds. For by the definition of the function Ξ on page 21, $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, B))$ is the set whose members are all the subsets D of the set $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{P}(G, B)) = B$ such that D neither overlaps any member of $\mathcal{P}(G, B)$ nor is a strict subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(G, B)$, (so that if S is any member of $\mathcal{P}(G, B)$, then either $S \subseteq D$ holds or $S \cap D = \emptyset$ holds). And similarly, $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, C))$ is the set whose members are all the nonempty subsets D of C such that if S is any member of $\mathcal{P}(G, C)$, then either $S \subseteq D$ holds or $S \cap D = \emptyset$ holds. Now since B and C are two *distinct* members of $(Y \vdash G)$, at most one of B and C can be equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$. Suppose $B = \mathcal{U}(V)$ holds. Then C is a member of $(Y \vdash (V \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}))$, hence by (i) above, $\mathcal{Y}(G, C)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and C is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G, C)$. Hence since, by the definition of an H-principal wood of V, *no* member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V, C is a *strict* subset of the member $\mathcal{Y}(G, C)$ of G. Now B is a member of $(Y \vdash G)$, hence $B = \mathcal{U}(V)$ implies $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is *not* a member of G. Hence every member of G is a *strict* subset of $\mathcal{U}(V)$ hence, by page 23, every member of G is a subset of some member of $\mathcal{P}(G, \mathcal{U}(V)) = \mathcal{P}(G, B)$, hence since C is a *strict* subset of some member of G, every member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, C))$ is a *strict* subset of some member of $\mathcal{P}(G, B)$, hence since *no* member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, B))$ is a *strict* subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(G, B)$, $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, B)) \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, C)) = \emptyset$ holds. Now suppose *neither B nor C* is equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$. Then B is a member of $(Y \vdash (V \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}))$ hence by (i) above, $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, B is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$, and $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is the *only* member A of G such that B is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A, and C is a member of $(Y \vdash (V \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}))$ hence by (i) above, $\mathcal{Y}(G,C)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, C is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G,C)$, and $\mathcal{Y}(G,C)$ is the *only* member A of G such that C is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A. Now since G is a wood, either $\mathcal{Y}(G,B) \cap \mathcal{Y}(G,C) = \emptyset$ holds or $\mathcal{Y}(G,B) = \mathcal{Y}(G,C)$ holds or $\mathcal{Y}(G,B) \subset \mathcal{Y}(G,C)$ holds or $\mathcal{Y}(G,C) \subset \mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ holds. Now if $\mathcal{Y}(G,B) \cap \mathcal{Y}(G,C) = \emptyset$ holds then $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B)) \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C)) = \emptyset$ holds. Suppose now that $\mathcal{Y}(G,B) = \mathcal{Y}(G,C)$ holds. Then B and C are two distinct $(V \cup H)$-firm over V components of A hence by Lemma 31, $B \cap C = \emptyset$ holds hence $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B)) \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C)) = \emptyset$ holds. Now suppose $\mathcal{Y}(G,B) \subset \mathcal{Y}(G,C)$ holds. Then by the definition of an H-principal wood of V, $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G,C)$, hence since $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ hence is *not* $(V \cup H)$-firm over V, hence cannot be *equal* to any $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G,C)$, $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is a *strict* subset of some $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G,C)$, hence since C is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G,C)$, either $\mathcal{Y}(G,B) \cap C = \emptyset$ holds or $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is a *strict* subset of C. Now if $\mathcal{Y}(G,B) \cap C = \emptyset$ holds then $B \cap C = \emptyset$ holds hence $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B)) \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C)) = \emptyset$ certainly holds. Now suppose that $\mathcal{Y}(G,B) \subset C$ holds. Then, by page 23, $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is a subset of some member of $\mathcal{P}(G,C)$ hence, since B is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ and $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ hence is *not* $(V \cup H)$-firm over V, hence $B \subset \mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ holds, B is a *strict* subset of some member of $\mathcal{P}(G,C)$, hence every member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$ is a *strict* subset of some member of $\mathcal{P}(G,C)$, hence since *no* member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C))$ is a *strict* subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(G,C)$, $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B)) \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C)) = \emptyset$ holds. And finally, if $\mathcal{Y}(G,C) \subset \mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ holds, then $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B)) \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C)) = \emptyset$ holds again by an analogous argument.

(v) Let B be any member of $(Y \vdash G)$ and C be any member of $(Y \cap G)$. Then C is *not* a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$. For by the definition of an H-principal wood of V, *no* member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V, hence the members of $(Y \cap G)$ are any members of V that are $(V \cup H)$-firm over V components of members of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, together with the set $\mathcal{U}(V)$ if $\mathcal{U}(V)$ *is* a member of G. Suppose first that B is equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$. Then $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is *not* a member of G, hence every member of G is a *strict* subset of $\mathcal{U}(V)$, hence by page 23, every member of G is a subset of some member of

$\mathcal{P}(G,\mathcal{U}(V)) = \mathcal{P}(G,B)$, and furthermore, C is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of some member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, hence C is a *strict* subset of some member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, hence C is a *strict* subset of some member of $\mathcal{P}(G,B)$, hence C is *not* a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$. Now assume B is *not* equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$, so B is a member of $(Y \vdash (V \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}))$, hence by (i) above, $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, B is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$, and $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is the *only* member A of G such that B is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A. Suppose first that C is equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$. Then since B is *not* equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$, hence B is a *strict* subset of $\mathcal{U}(V)$, every member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$ is a *strict* subset of $\mathcal{U}(V)$, hence $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is certainly not a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$. Now assume C is *not* equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$, so C is a member of V that is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of some member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$. Let A be a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ such that C is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A. Then since G is a wood, either $\mathcal{Y}(G,B) \cap A = \emptyset$ holds or $\mathcal{Y}(G,B) = A$ holds or $\mathcal{Y}(G,B) \subset A$ holds or $A \subset \mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ holds, and if $\mathcal{Y}(G,B) \cap A = \emptyset$ holds then C is certainly not a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$. Suppose now that $\mathcal{Y}(G,B) = A$ holds. Then B is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ such that B is *not* a member of V, and C is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ such that C *is* a member of V, hence since, by Lemma 31, distinct $(V \cup H)$-firm over V components of $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ do not intersect one another, C is *not* a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$. Now suppose that $\mathcal{Y}(G,B) \subset A$ holds. Then by the definition of an H-principal wood of V, $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is a subset of some $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A, and since $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ and C is a member of V, $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ is a subset of some $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A that is *not* equal to C hence, again by Lemma 31, $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ does *not* intersect C, hence C is not a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$. And finally suppose that $A \subset \mathcal{Y}(G,B)$ holds. Then by the definition of an H-principal wood of V, A is a subset of some $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G,B)$, hence either $A \cap B = \emptyset$ holds or $A \subseteq B$ holds, and if $A \cap B = \emptyset$ holds then C is certainly not a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$. Suppose now that $A \subseteq B$ holds. Then since A is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ hence is *not* $(V \cup H)$-firm over V, and B *is* $(V \cup H)$-firm over V, A is a *strict* subset of B hence, by page 23, A is a subset of some member of $\mathcal{P}(G,B)$ hence, since C is a member of V hence is a *strict* subset of A, C is a *strict* subset of some member of $\mathcal{P}(G,B)$, hence C is not a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$.

(vi) Let F be any member of $\mathbb{O}(G,H)$, or in other words, let F be any member of $\mathcal{G}(V,H)$ such that $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}(F,H)$ holds, and let B be any member of $(Y \vdash G)$. Then

$F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$ is a member of $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{P}(G,B), H)$. For no member of $F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$ is empty, and since $G \subseteq F$ holds, every member of $\mathcal{P}(G,B)$ is a member of F, hence every member of $\mathcal{P}(G,B)$ is a member of $F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$ hence, since no two members of F overlap one another, hence no two members of $F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$ overlap one another, $F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$ is a wood of $\mathcal{P}(G,B)$. And furthermore the fact that every member of F is $(V \cup H)$-connected implies that every member of $F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$ is $(\mathcal{P}(G,B) \cup H)$-connected, for if C is any member of $F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$ and $\{J, K\}$ is any partition of C into two nonempty parts, then there exists a member E of $(V \cup H)$ such that E intersects both J and K. Let E be a member of $(V \cup H)$ such that E intersects both J and K. Then if E is a member of H, E is a member of $(\mathcal{P}(G,B) \cup H)$, while if E is a member of V, then E is either a subset of or disjoint from each member of F, hence since C is a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$ and E intersects C, E intersects some member of $\mathcal{P}(G,B)$ hence is a subset of that member of $\mathcal{P}(G,B)$, and if S is the member of $\mathcal{P}(G,B)$ that contains E as a subset, then S is a member of $(\mathcal{P}(G,B) \cup H)$ that intersects both J and K.

(vii) Let F be any member of $\mathbb{O}(G,H)$, or in other words, let F be any member of $\mathcal{G}(V,H)$ such that $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}(F,H)$ holds. Then F is equal to the disjoint union of the sets $F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$ associated with all the members B of $(Y \vdash G)$, together with the set $(Y \cap G)$, or in other words, the set whose members are the sets $F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$ associated with all the members B of $(Y \vdash G)$, together with the set $(Y \cap G)$, is a partition of F. For if B and C are any two distinct members of $(Y \vdash G)$, then $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B)) \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C)) = \emptyset$ holds by (iv) above, hence $(F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))) \cap (F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C))) = \emptyset$ certainly holds. And if B is any member of $(Y \vdash G)$ and C is any member of $(Y \cap G)$, then by (v) above, C is *not* a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$, hence C is certainly not a member of $F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$, hence if B is any member of $(Y \vdash G)$, then $(F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))) \cap (Y \cap G) = \emptyset$ certainly holds. Now $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}(F,H)$ implies that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and C is any member of F such that $C \subset A$ holds, then C is a subset of some $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A. Now let C be any member of F, and suppose first that there is *no* member A of G such that $C \subset A$ holds. Then either C is equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$, or else $C \subset \mathcal{U}(V)$ holds and $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is *not* a member of G. Suppose first that C is equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$. Then if $\mathcal{U}(V)$ *is* a member of G, $C = \mathcal{U}(V)$ is a member of $(Y \cap G)$, while if $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is *not* a member of G, then $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is a member of $(Y \vdash G)$, and $C = \mathcal{U}(V)$ is a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, \mathcal{U}(V)))$ Now suppose that

$C \subset \mathcal{U}(V)$ holds, hence that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is *not* a member of G, since by assumption there is *no* member A of G such that $C \subset A$ holds. Then $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is a member of $(Y \vdash G)$. Now $C \subseteq \mathcal{U}(V)$ certainly holds. Let S be any member of $\mathcal{P}(G, \mathcal{U}(V))$. Then S is a member of F since $G \subseteq F$ holds, hence S does not overlap C, hence since $C \subset S$ does *not* hold by assumption, either $S \subseteq C$ holds or $S \cap C = \emptyset$ holds. Hence C is a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, \mathcal{U}(V)))$. Now let C be any member of F such that there *does* exist a member A of G such that $C \subset A$ holds. Let A be the *smallest* member of G to contain C as a *strict* subset. Now $C \subset A$ holds hence A cannot be a member of V, hence A is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ hence, as noted above, the fact that G is a subset of $\mathbb{P}(F, H)$ implies that C is a subset of some $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A. Let B be the $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A that contains C as a subset. Then if B is a member of V, the facts that $C \subseteq B$ holds and that C is a member of F, hence that C is a member of $\Xi(V)$, imply that $C = B$ holds, and the facts that A is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ and that B is a member of V, hence that B is a member of G, imply that B is a member of $(Y \cap G)$, hence that C is a member of $(Y \cap G)$. Now suppose that B is *not* a member of V, and let S be any member of $\mathcal{P}(G, B)$. Then S is a member of F hence S does not overlap C, and $C \subset S$ cannot hold, for if $C \subset S$ *did* hold then A would *not* be the *smallest* member of G to contain C as a *strict* subset, contrary to assumption. Hence since $C \subseteq B$ implies that C is a subset of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{P}(G, B)) = B$, C is a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, B))$.

(viii) Let J be any map such that $\mathcal{D}(J) = (Y \vdash G)$ holds, and such that for each member B of $(Y \vdash G)$, J_B is a member of $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{P}(G, B), H)$. Then the set $F \equiv \left(\bigcup_{B \in (Y \vdash G)} J_B\right) \cup (Y \cap G)$ is a member of $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$, or in other words, F is a member of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$ such that $G \subseteq F$ holds, and if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ and C is any member of F such that $C \subset A$ holds, then C is a subset of some $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A.

For we first note that $\mathcal{U}(F) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(V)$ holds, and furthermore, if B is any member of $(Y \vdash G)$, then J_B is a subset of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, B))$, and $\mathcal{P}(G, B)$ is a partition that is a subset of $\Xi(V)$, hence by the observation at the top of page 33, J_B is a subset of $\Xi(V)$.

Hence, since $(Y \cap G)$ is certainly a subset of $\Xi(V)$, F is a subset of $\Xi(V)$.

We next note that G is certainly a member of $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$, hence by (vii) above, (with the wood F of (vii) above taken as G), G is equal to the disjoint union of the sets $G \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, B))$ for the members B of $(Y \vdash G)$, together with the set $(Y \cap G)$. But for $B \in (Y \vdash G)$ the set $G \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, B))$ is equal to $\mathcal{P}(G, B)$, and hence is a subset of J_B, hence G *is* a subset of F.

Hence, in particular, V is a subset of F.

Now let C and D be any members of F. We first note that if either C or D is a member of $(Y \cap G)$, then since $(Y \cap G)$ is a subset of $V \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}$, and F is a subset of $\Xi(V)$, and no member of $\Xi(V)$ overlaps either $\mathcal{U}(V)$ or any member of V, C and D do *not* overlap. Suppose now that neither C nor D is a member of $(Y \cap G)$. Then since, by (iv) above, the sets $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, B))$ for distinct members B of $(Y \vdash G)$ do not intersect one another, there exists a unique member S of $(Y \vdash G)$ such that C is a member of J_S, and there exists a unique member T of $(Y \vdash G)$ such that D is a member of J_T. Let S be the unique member of $(Y \vdash G)$ such that $C \in J_S$ holds, and let T be the unique member of $(Y \vdash G)$ such that $D \in J_T$ holds. Then if S is equal to T, both C and D are members of the wood $J_S = J_T$, hence C does not overlap D. Suppose now that S is *not* equal to T. Then since, by (iii) above, $G \cup Y$ is a wood of V, either $S \cap T = \emptyset$ holds or $S \subset T$ holds or $T \subset S$ holds. We first note that if $S \cap T = \emptyset$ holds, then $C \cap D = \emptyset$ holds. Suppose now that $S \subset T$ holds. Then S is certainly not equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$, and S is a member of $(Y \vdash G)$ hence S is not a member of V, hence by (i) above, $\mathcal{Y}(G, S)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and S is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G, S)$. Suppose first that T is equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$. Then since T is a member of $(Y \vdash G)$, $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is *not* a member of G, hence $\mathcal{Y}(G, S)$ is a *strict* subset of $\mathcal{U}(V)$, hence by page 23, there is a unique member E of $\mathcal{P}(G, \mathcal{U}(V)) = \mathcal{P}(G, T)$ such that $\mathcal{Y}(G, S) \subseteq E$ holds. Let E be the unique member of $\mathcal{P}(G, T)$ such that $\mathcal{Y}(G, S) \subseteq E$ holds. Then since D is a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, T))$, either $E \subseteq D$ holds or $E \cap D = \emptyset$ holds, and if $E \subseteq D$ holds then $C \subseteq D$ holds, while if $E \cap D = \emptyset$ holds then $C \cap D = \emptyset$ holds. Now suppose that T is *not* equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$, hence that T is a member of $(Y \vdash (V \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}))$. Then by (i) above, $\mathcal{Y}(G, T)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and T is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G, T)$. Now $S \subset T$ implies that $\mathcal{Y}(G, S) \subseteq \mathcal{Y}(G, T)$ holds, and by Lemma 31 the distinct $(V \cup H)$-firm over V components of $\mathcal{Y}(G, T)$ do not intersect one another, hence $\mathcal{Y}(G, S)$ cannot equal $\mathcal{Y}(G, T)$, (for if $\mathcal{Y}(G, S) = \mathcal{Y}(G, T)$ held then S and T would be two distinct $(V \cup H)$-firm over V components of $\mathcal{Y}(G, T)$ such that $S \cap T = S$ is nonempty), hence $\mathcal{Y}(G, S) \subset \mathcal{Y}(G, T)$ holds, hence by the definition of an H-principal wood of V, $\mathcal{Y}(G, S)$ is a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G, T)$, hence since $\mathcal{Y}(G, S) \cap T$ has the nonempty subset S, $\mathcal{Y}(G, S) \subseteq T$ holds by Lemma 31. Now $\mathcal{Y}(G, S)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ hence is *not* $(V \cup H)$-firm over V, hence $\mathcal{Y}(G,S)$ is not equal to T, hence $\mathcal{Y}(G,S) \subset T$ holds, hence by page 23 there exists a unique member E of $\mathcal{P}(G,T)$ such that $\mathcal{Y}(G,S) \subseteq E$ holds, (just as in the case where T was equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$). Let E be the unique member of $\mathcal{P}(G,T)$ such that $\mathcal{Y}(G,S) \subseteq E$ holds. Then since D is a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,T))$, either $E \subseteq D$ holds or $E \cap D = \emptyset$ holds, and if $E \subseteq D$ holds then $C \subseteq D$ holds, while if $E \cap D = \emptyset$ holds then $C \cap D = \emptyset$ holds.

And if $T \subset S$ holds, we find by an exactly analogous argument that either $D \subseteq C$ holds or $D \cap C = \emptyset$ holds.

Hence F is a subset of $\Xi(V)$ such that $V \subseteq F$ holds and no two members of F overlap, hence F is a wood of V, and furthermore $G \subseteq F$ holds, as shown on page 161.

Now every member of G is $(V \cup H)$-connected by the definition of an H-principal wood of V, hence in particular every member of $(Y \cap G)$ is $(V \cup H)$-connected, and furthermore $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is $(V \cup H)$-connected by assumption. Now let B be any member of $(Y \vdash G)$ and let C be any member of J_B. Then C is a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$ such that C is $(\mathcal{P}(G,B) \cup H)$-connected. Let $\{J,K\}$ be any partition of C into two nonempty parts. Then there exists a member E of $(\mathcal{P}(G,B) \cup H)$ such that E intersects both J and K. Let E be a member of $(\mathcal{P}(G,B) \cup H)$ such that E intersects both J and K. Then if E is a member of H, E is a member of $(V \cup H)$ such that E intersects both J and K. Suppose now that E is a member of $\mathcal{P}(G,B)$. Then since E intersects C, and C is a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$, $E \subseteq C$ holds, hence $\{(E \cap J),(E \cap K)\}$ is a partition of E into two nonempty parts, hence since E is a member of G hence E is $(V \cup H)$-connected, there exists a member M of $(V \cup H)$ such that M intersects both $(E \cap J)$ and $(E \cap K)$, and any such member M of $(V \cup H)$ is a member of $(V \cup H)$ that intersects both J and K.

Hence every member of F is $(V \cup H)$-connected, hence F is a member of $\mathcal{G}(V,H)$.

Now let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ and C be any member of F such that $C \subset A$ holds. Suppose first that C is a member of $(Y \cap G)$. Then C is a member of G, hence by the definition of an H-principal wood of V, C is a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A. Now suppose there exists a member B of $(Y \vdash G)$ such that C is a member of J_B. Then since, by (iv) above, the sets $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$ for distinct members B of $(Y \vdash G)$ do not intersect one another, there exists a *unique* member B of $(Y \vdash G)$ such that C is a member of J_B. Let B be the unique member of $(Y \vdash G)$ such that C is a member of J_B. Now by (iii) above, B does not overlap A, and $B \cap A$ has the nonempty subset C, hence $B \cap A$ is nonempty, and C is a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$, hence $A \subset B$

cannot hold, for if $A \subset B$ held then by page 23, A would be a subset of some member of $\mathcal{P}(G, B)$, hence $C \subset A$ would imply that C is a *strict* subset of some member of $\mathcal{P}(G, B)$, which contradicts $C \in \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, B))$. Hence $B \subseteq A$ holds hence, since A *is* a member of G, and B is *not* a member of G, hence B is *not* equal to A, $B \subset A$ holds. Hence B is certainly not equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$, hence since B is a member of $(Y \vdash G)$ hence B is a member of $(Y \vdash V)$, it follows from (i) above that $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and that B is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$. Now $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ does not overlap A, hence since $B \subset A$ holds and $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ is the *smallest* member of G to contain B as a subset, $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \subseteq A$ holds. Suppose first that $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) = A$ holds. Then B is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $A = \mathcal{Y}(G, B)$, hence since C is a subset of B, C is a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A. Now suppose that $\mathcal{Y}(G, B) \subset A$ holds. Then by the definition of an H-principal wood of V, $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$ is a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A, hence since C is a subset of $\mathcal{Y}(G, B)$, C is a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A.

Hence F is a member of $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$.

(ix) Let X be the set whose members are all the maps J such that $\mathcal{D}(J)$ is equal to $(Y \vdash G)$, and for each member B of $(Y \vdash G)$, J_B is a member of $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{P}(G, B), H)$, let E be the map such that $\mathcal{D}(E) = X$ holds and such that for each member J of X, $E_J \equiv \left(\bigcup_{B \in (Y \vdash G)} J_B\right) \cup (Y \cap G)$ holds, and let M be the map whose domain is equal to $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$, and such that for each member F of $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$, M_F is the map whose domain is $(Y \vdash G)$, and such that for each member B of $(Y \vdash G)$, $M_{FB} \equiv (M_F)_B$ is equal to $F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, B))$. Then E is a *bijection* whose domain is X and whose range is equal to $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$, M is a *bijection* whose domain is $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$ and whose range is equal to X, and M is the inverse of E and E is the inverse of M.

For by (viii) above, $\mathcal{R}(E) \subseteq \mathbb{O}(G, H)$ holds. Now let F be any member of $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$. Then by (vi) above, for each member B of $(Y \vdash G)$, $F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, B))$ is a member of $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{P}(G, B), H)$. Hence $\mathcal{R}(M)$ is a subset of X. And furthermore, by (vii) above, for each member F of $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$,

$$E_{M_F} = \left(\bigcup_{B \in (Y \vdash G)} M_{FB}\right) \cup (Y \cap G) = \left(\bigcup_{B \in (Y \vdash G)} (F \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, B)))\right) \cup (Y \cap G)$$

is equal to F. Thus *every* member F of $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$ is a member of $\mathcal{R}(E)$, hence $\mathcal{R}(E)$ is equal to $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$. Now let J and K be any two *distinct* members of X. Then since, for every member B of $(Y \vdash G)$, $J_B \subseteq \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$ holds and $K_B \subseteq \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$ holds, and by (iv) above, the sets $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$ for *distinct* members B of $(Y \vdash G)$ do *not* intersect one another, and by (v) above, the set $(Y \cap G)$ does *not* intersect the set $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))$ for any member B of $(Y \vdash G)$, and furthermore, the fact that J is *not* equal to K implies that there is at least one member B of $(Y \vdash G)$ such that J_B is *not* equal to K_B, E_J is *not* equal to E_K. Hence for each member F of $\mathbb{O}(G,H)$, there is *exactly one* member J of X such that E_J is equal to F, hence, since $\mathcal{R}(E)$ is a subset of $\mathbb{O}(G,H)$, E is a *bijection* whose domain is X and whose range is equal to $\mathbb{O}(G,H)$. Finally we note that the facts that $\mathcal{R}(E)$ is a subset of $\mathbb{O}(G,H)$, $\mathcal{R}(M)$ is a subset of X, and that for each member F of $\mathbb{O}(G,H)$, E_{M_F} is equal to F, and that for any two distinct members J and K of X, E_J is *not* equal to E_K, together imply that $\mathcal{R}(M)$ is *equal* to X, for if $(X \vdash \mathcal{R}(M))$ was nonempty and J was a member of $(X \vdash \mathcal{R}(M))$, then since M_{E_J} *is* a member of $\mathcal{R}(M)$, J and M_{E_J} would be two distinct members of X such that $E_J = E_{M_{E_J}}$ held. Hence M is a *bijection* whose domain is $\mathbb{O}(G,H)$ and whose range is equal to X, and M is the inverse of E and E is the inverse of M.

Lemma 36. If U is a set such that every member of U is a set, A is a U-connected set, E is a U-key of A such that $\#(E) = 2$, $\{B,C\}$ is a partition of A such that $B \cap E \neq \emptyset$, $C \cap E \neq \emptyset$, and E is the *only* member of U to have nonempty intersection with both B and C, and $\{J,K\}$ is a partition of A such that $J \cap E \neq \emptyset$, $K \cap E \neq \emptyset$, and E is the *only* member of U to have nonempty intersection with both J and K, then $\{B,C\} = \{J,K\}$.

Proof. Suppose $\{B,C\} \neq \{J,K\}$. Then either $B \cap J$ and $B \cap K$ are both nonempty, or $C \cap J$ and $C \cap K$ are both nonempty. For $B \cap J$ and $C \cap J$ cannot both be empty since $(B \cap J) \cup (C \cap J) = J$, and $B \cap K$ and $C \cap K$ cannot both be empty since $(B \cap K) \cup (C \cap K) = K$, and if $B \cap J$ and $C \cap K$ are both empty then $B = K$ holds and $C = J$ holds hence $\{B,C\} = \{J,K\}$ holds, contrary to assumption, and if $B \cap K$ and $C \cap J$ are both empty then $B = J$ holds and $C = K$ holds hence again $\{B,C\} = \{J,K\}$ holds, contrary to assumption, hence every case where at least one of $B \cap J$ and $B \cap K$ is empty *and* at least one of $C \cap J$ and $C \cap K$ is empty, is excluded.

Suppose now for definiteness that $B \cap J$ and $B \cap K$ are both nonempty. Then since B is U-connected by Lemma 25, there exists a member S of U such that $(B \cap J) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ and $(B \cap K) \cap S \neq \emptyset$. Now this implies that S has at least two *distinct* members that are members of B, hence since by assumption $\#(E) = 2$ holds and one of the members of E is a member of C hence not a member of B, S is not equal to E. But this contradicts the assumption that E is the *only* member of U to have nonempty intersection with both J and K.

Theorem 2. Let V be a partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is finite and $\#(V) \geq 2$ holds, and let H be a partition such that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is $(V \cup H)$-connected and such that if E is any member of H such that E intersects *more* than one member of V, then E has *exactly* two members. (Hence *no* member of H intersects *more* than two members of V.)

Let W be the subset of H whose members are all the members E of H such that E intersects exactly two members of V. (Thus W is a partition such that every member E of W has exactly two members.)

Let d be an integer ≥ 1.

Let Z be the subset of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)}$ whose members are all the members y of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)}$ such that $|y_i - y_j| = 0$ holds for at least one member $\{i, j\}$ of W.

Let θ be a member of $\mathbb{Z}^W$ such that $\theta_\Delta < d$ holds for every member Δ of W.

Let g be a map such that $\mathcal{D}(g)$ is finite and $\mathcal{R}(g) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(V)$ holds, and let c be a map such that $\mathcal{D}(g) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(c)$ holds and for each member α of $\mathcal{D}(g)$, c_α is a unit d-vector.

For any ordered pair (i, j) of a map i such that $\mathcal{D}(i)$ is finite and $\mathcal{R}(i) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(V)$ holds, and a member j of $\mathcal{U}(V)$, let ν_{ij} denote the number of members α of $\mathcal{D}(i)$ such that $i_\alpha = j$ holds.

For each member A of $(\Xi(V) \vdash V)$, we define

$$D_A \equiv \left(\sum_{\Delta \equiv \{j,k\} \in (W \cap \mathcal{Q}(A))} (\theta_\Delta + \nu_{gj} + \nu_{gk}) \right) - d\left(\#(\mathcal{P}(V, A)) - 1\right).$$

Let $N \equiv \#(\mathcal{D}(g)) + \sum_{A \in (\Xi(V) \vdash V)} (1 + \max(D_A, 0))$.

Let M be a finite real number ≥ 0, and let S and T be finite real numbers such that $0 < S < T$ holds.

Let $\mathcal{J}$ be a map whose domain is $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$, and such that for each member F of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$, $\mathcal{J}_F$ is a map whose domain is $\left(\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)} \vdash Z\right)$ and whose range is a subset of $\mathbb{R}$.

For each member F of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$, and for each member y of $\left(\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)} \vdash Z\right)$, we define $\mathcal{J}_F(y) \equiv (\mathcal{J}_F)_y$.

Let $\mathcal{J}$ satisfy the requirement that if F and G are members of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$, and y is a member of $\left(\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)} \vdash Z\right)$, such that for every member $\{i, j\}$ of W, either $|y_i - y_j| \leq S$ holds or $\mathcal{Y}(F, \{i, j\}) = \mathcal{Y}(G, \{i, j\})$ holds, then $\mathcal{J}_F(y) = \mathcal{J}_G(y)$ holds.

Let $\mathcal{J}$ also satisfy the requirement that for each member F of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$, $\mathcal{J}_F(y)$ and all its derivatives with respect to the y_i, $i \in \mathcal{U}(V)$, of degree up to and including N, exist and are continuous for all $y \in \left(\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)} \vdash Z\right)$.

For each member S of W, we define the d-vector differential operator t_S by $t_S \equiv (\hat{y}_j + \hat{y}_k)$, where j and k are the two members of S, or in other words, $S = \{j, k\}$, and the d-vector index has not been shown.

And let $\mathcal{J}$ also satisfy the requirement that if i is any map such that $\mathcal{D}(i)$ is finite and $\mathcal{R}(i) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(V)$ holds, u is any map such that $\mathcal{D}(i) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(u)$ holds and for each member α of $\mathcal{D}(i)$, u_α is a unit d-vector, E is any map such that $\mathcal{D}(E)$ is finite and $\mathcal{R}(E) \subseteq W$ holds, and v is any map such that $\mathcal{D}(E) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(v)$ holds and for each member β of $\mathcal{D}(E)$, v_β is a unit d-vector, and if the maps i and E furthermore satisfy the requirement that $\#(\mathcal{D}(i)) + \#(\mathcal{D}(E)) \leq N$ holds, then the following inequality holds for all $F \in \mathcal{G}(V, H)$ and for all $y \in \left(\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)} \vdash Z\right)$:

$$\left| \left(\prod_{\beta \in \mathcal{D}(E)} \left(v_\beta . t_{E_\beta} \right) \right) \left(\prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{D}(i)} \left(u_\alpha . \hat{y}_{i_\alpha} \right) \right) \mathcal{J}_F(y) \right| \leq M \prod_{\Delta \equiv \{j,k\} \in W} |y_j - y_k|^{-(\theta_\Delta + \nu_{ij} + \nu_{ik})},$$

where in accordance with the definition on page 166, and for any member m of $\mathcal{U}(V)$, ν_{im} denotes the number of members α of $\mathcal{D}(i)$ such that $i_\alpha = m$ holds.

And let $\mathcal{J}$ also satisfy the requirement that if y is any member of $\left(\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)} \vdash Z\right)$ such that $|y_i - y_j| \geq T$ holds for any member $\{i, j\}$ of W, then $\mathcal{J}_F(y) = 0$ holds for all members F of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$.

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ be any map such that $\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}\right) = \mathbb{N}$ holds, and such that for each member k of $\mathbb{N}$, $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_k$ is a map such that $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_k$ has all the properties assumed above for the map $\mathcal{J}$, and such that furthermore, for every member k of $\mathbb{N}$, and every member F of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$,and *every* member y of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)}$, $\mathcal{J}_{kF}(y) \equiv \left((\mathcal{J}_k)_F\right)_y$ is defined, continuous and continuously differentiable with respect to the y_i, $i \in \mathcal{U}(V)$, up to total degree N.

And let $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ satisfy the requirement that for any given real number $\varepsilon > 0$ and any given real number $r > 0$, there exists a member k of $\mathbb{N}$ such that for all integers $m \geq k$, and for all members y of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)}$ such that $|y_i - y_j| \geq r$ holds for all members $\{i, j\}$ of W, and for all maps i and u such that $\mathcal{D}(i)$ is finite, $\#(\mathcal{D}(i)) \leq N$ holds, $\mathcal{R}(i) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(V)$ holds, $\mathcal{D}(i) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(u)$ holds, and for each member α of $\mathcal{D}(i)$, u_α is a unit d-vector, $\left| \left(\prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{D}(i)} u_\alpha . \hat{y}_{i_\alpha} \right) \left(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{mF}(y) - \mathcal{J}_F(y) \right) \right| \leq \varepsilon$ holds for all members F of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$.

Let ω be any set of contraction weights for V, let h be any member of $\mathcal{U}(V)$, let $O \equiv \mathcal{C}(V, h)$, let b be any member of $\mathbb{E}_d$, and let $\mathbb{W}$ be the subset of $\mathbb{U}_d(V, \omega)$ whose members are all the members x of $\mathbb{U}_d\left(V, \omega\right)$ such that $x_O = b$ holds.

For each member k of $\mathbb{N}$, let I_k be defined by:

$$I_k \equiv \int_{\mathbb{W}} \left(\prod_{A \in (V \vdash \{O\})} d^d x_A \right) \left(\sum_{F \in \mathcal{V}(V,H)} (-1)^{\#(\mathbb{B}(F))} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{X}(\mathbb{I}(F,H),D)} \times \right.$$

$$\left. \times \left(\left(\prod_{(i,A) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{I}(F,H)))} \left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(F,A,i)} - x_A\right) . \hat{y}_i\right)^{n_{iA}}}{n_{iA}!} \right) \right) \left(\prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{D}(g)} c_\alpha . \hat{y}_{g_\alpha} \right) \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kF}\left(y\right) \right)_{y = \eta(F,H,x)} \right)$$

Then for each member k of $\mathbb{N}$, I_k is a finite real number, and the I_k, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, form a Cauchy sequence, or in other words, for any given real number $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a member k of $\mathbb{N}$ such that for all members l and m of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $l \geq k$ and $m \geq k$ both hold, $|I_l - I_m| \leq \varepsilon$ holds. (We note that by the completeness of $\mathbb{R}$, it follows directly from this that there exists a unique finite real number I such that for any given real number $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a member k of $\mathbb{N}$ such that for all members l of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $l \geq k$ holds, $|I_l - I| \leq \varepsilon$ holds.)

Proof. We first note that it follows directly from the assumed properties of $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ that for each member k of $\mathbb{N}$, I_k is a finite real number, hence it remains to prove that the I_k, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, form a Cauchy sequence.

For each member k of $\mathbb{N}$, and for each H-principal wood G of V, we define $\tilde{I}_{kG}$ to be given by the same expression as I_k, but with the sum over the members F of $\mathcal{V}\left(V, H\right)$ replaced by the sum over the members F of $\mathbb{O}\left(G, H\right)$. Then by Lemma 34, the following identity holds for each member k of $\mathbb{N}$:

$$I_k = \sum_{G \in \mathcal{W}(V,H)} (-1)^{\#(\mathbb{B}(G))} \tilde{I}_{kG}.$$

Now $\mathcal{W}\left(V, H\right)$ is a finite set, hence it will be sufficient to prove that for every H-principal wood G of V, the $\tilde{I}_{kG}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, form a Cauchy sequence. We shall prove that if G is any H-principal wood of V, then the $\tilde{I}_{kG}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, form a Cauchy sequence.

Let G be any H-principal wood of V, let Y be the set whose members are all the $(V \cup H)$-firm over V components of members of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$, together with the set $\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)$, let X be the set whose members are all the maps J such that $\mathcal{D}\left(J\right)$ is equal to $(Y \vdash G)$, and for each member B of $(Y \vdash G)$, J_B is a member of $\mathcal{G}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G, B\right), H\right)$, and let E be the map such that $\mathcal{D}\left(E\right) = X$ holds and such that for each member J of X,

$E_J \equiv \left(\bigcup_{B \in (Y \vdash G)} J_B\right) \cup (Y \cap G)$ holds. Then by Lemma 35 (ix), and for each member k of $\mathbb{N}$, $\tilde{I}_{kG}$ is equal to

$$\int_{\mathbb{W}} \left(\prod_{A \in (V \vdash \{O\})} d^d x_A\right) \left(\sum_{J \in X} (-1)^{\#(\mathbb{B}(E_J))} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{X}(\mathbb{I}(E_J,H),D)} \times\right.$$

$$\left.\times\left(\left(\prod_{(i,A) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{I}(E_J,H)))} \left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(E_J,A,i)} - x_A\right) . \hat{y}_i\right)^{n_{iA}}}{n_{iA}!}\right)\right)\left(\prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{D}(g)} c_\alpha . \hat{y}_{g_\alpha}\right) \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kE_J}(y)\right)_{y = \eta(E_J,H,x)}\right)$$

We now choose a real number σ such that $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{3}{25}$ holds, and we define the real number λ by $\lambda \equiv \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - 8\sigma}\right)$, so that $0 < \lambda \leq \frac{1}{5}$ holds.

We note that λ and σ satisfy the equation $\lambda = \frac{\sigma}{1 - 2\lambda}$, and that $0 < \sigma < \lambda$ holds.

And we choose a real number R such that $0 < R \leq (1 - 2\lambda) S$ holds.

Then for any member B of $(Y \vdash G)$, for any member J_B of $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{P}(G,B), H)$, and for any member x of $\mathbb{U}_d(V,\omega)$, the following identity holds by page 63:

$$\sum_{(P_B,Q_B) \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P}(G,B),H)} \mathcal{E}(P_B, Q_B, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B)))) \mathcal{S}(P_B, J_B) \mathcal{S}(J_B, Q_B) = 1$$

We define $\tilde{X}$ to be the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (P,Q) of members of X such that for every member B of $(Y \vdash G)$, (P_B, Q_B) is a member of $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P}(G,B), H)$. (Thus $\tilde{X}$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (P,Q) of members of X such that for every member B of $(Y \vdash G)$, $P_B \subseteq Q_B$ holds.) Then it immediately follows from the preceding identity that for every member J of X, and for every member x of $\mathbb{U}_d(V,\omega)$, the following identity holds:

$$\sum_{(P,Q) \in \tilde{X}} \prod_{B \in (Y \vdash G)} \left(\mathcal{E}(P_B, Q_B, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B)))) \mathcal{S}(P_B, J_B) \mathcal{S}(J_B, Q_B)\right) = 1$$

Now by (iv) and (v) of Lemma 35, $\prod_{B \in (Y \vdash G)} \mathcal{S}(P_B, J_B) = \mathcal{S}(E_P, E_J)$ holds and $\prod_{B \in (Y \vdash G)} \mathcal{S}(J_B, Q_B) = \mathcal{S}(E_J, E_Q)$ holds.

Hence if we insert the above identity into a sum over the members J of X, and take the sum over the members (P,Q) of $\tilde{X}$ outside the sum over the members J of X, then in the term associated with the member (P,Q) of $\tilde{X}$, the sum over the members J of X reduces to a sum over those members J of X such that $E_J \in \mathbb{K}(E_P, E_Q)$ holds. And furthermore, by Lemma 35 (ix), it directly follows from the fact that (P,Q) is a member of $\tilde{X}$, that for *every* member F of $\mathbb{K}\left(E_P, E_Q\right)$, there is *exactly one* member J of X such that $E_J = F$ holds, and the member J of X corresponding to the member F of $\mathbb{K}\left(E_P, E_Q\right)$ is given by $J = M_F$, where M is the map defined in Lemma 35 (ix). Hence in the term associated with the member (P, Q) of $\tilde{X}$, the sum over the members J of X reduces to the sum over the members F of $\mathbb{K}\left(E_P, E_Q\right)$.

We now define $\tilde{\mathbb{O}}\left(G, H\right)$ to be the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (P, Q) of members P and Q of $\mathbb{O}\left(G, H\right)$ such that $P \subseteq Q$ holds. Then it immediately follows from (iv), (v), and (ix) of Lemma 35, that $\tilde{\mathbb{O}}\left(G, H\right)$ is equal to the set of all ordered pairs (P, Q) of members of $\mathbb{O}\left(G, H\right)$ such that for every member B of $(Y \vdash G)$, $\left(P \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G, B\right)\right)\right) \subseteq \left(Q \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G, B\right)\right)\right)$ holds, and furthermore that the set $\tilde{\mathbb{O}}\left(G, H\right)$ is in one-to-one correspondence with the set $\tilde{X}$, with the correspondences being given by the map E and the map M defined in Lemma 35 (ix).

Hence for each member k of $\mathbb{N}$, $\tilde{I}_{kG}$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{W}} \Bigg(\prod_{A \in (V \vdash \{O\})} d^d x_A \Bigg) \Bigg(\sum_{(P,Q) \in \tilde{\mathbb{O}}(G,H)} \Bigg(\Bigg(\prod_{B \in (Y \vdash G)} \times \\
&\qquad \times \mathcal{E}\left(\left(P \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G, B\right)\right)\right), \left(Q \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G, B\right)\right)\right), H, \sigma, R, \downarrow\left(x, \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G, B\right)\right)\right)\right) \Bigg) \times \\
&\times \sum_{F \in \mathbb{K}(P,Q)} (-1)^{\#(\mathbb{B}(F))} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{X}(\mathbb{I}(F,H),D)} \Bigg(\Bigg(\prod_{(i,A) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{I}(F,H)))} \left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(F,A,i)} - x_A\right) . \hat{y}_i\right)^{n_{iA}}}{n_{iA}!} \right) \Bigg) \times \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \times \Bigg(\prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{D}(g)} c_\alpha . \hat{y}_{g_\alpha} \Bigg) \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kF}\left(y\right) \Bigg)_{y = \eta(F,H,x)} \Bigg) \Bigg)
\end{aligned}$$

We shall prove that for each member (P, Q) of the finite set $\tilde{\mathbb{O}}\left(G, H\right)$, the integrals over $\mathbb{W}$ of the term associated with (P, Q) in the integrands of these integrals for the members k of $\mathbb{N}$, form a Cauchy sequence.

We first use Lemma 22 to conclude that the term associated with (P, Q) in the integrand of the above integral for the member k of $\mathbb{N}$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
&(-1)^{\#(\mathbb{B}(P))} \times \\
&\times \Bigg(\prod_{B \in (Y \vdash G)} \mathcal{E}\left(\left(P \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G, B\right)\right)\right), \left(Q \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G, B\right)\right)\right), H, \sigma, R, \downarrow\left(x, \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G, B\right)\right)\right)\right) \Bigg) \times
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\times \sum_{u\in\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P),D)} \; \sum_{m\in\mathbb{A}(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H),(D-\xi(P,Q,H,u)+\mathbf{1}))} \int_{\mathbb{D}} \left(d^{\#(Q\vdash P)}\rho\right) \times \\
\times \Bigg(\left(\prod_{A\in(Q\vdash P)} \left(1-\rho_A\right)^{\left(D_A-\xi_A(P,Q,H,u)\right)} \left(D_A-\xi_A\left(P,Q,H,u\right)+1\right) \right) \times \\
\times \left(\prod_{((i,B),X)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H))))} \left(\prod_{E\in(\mathbb{G}_{iB}(Q,H)\vdash X)} \rho_E \right)^{m_{iBX}} \right) \times \\
\times \Bigg(\left(\prod_{((i,B),X)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H))))} \left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,B,i)}-x_B\right).\hat{y}_i\right)^{m_{iBX}}}{m_{iBX}!} \right) \right) \times \\
\times \left(\prod_{(i,A)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P)))} \left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,A,i)}-x_A\right).\hat{y}_i\right)^{u_{iA}}}{u_{iA}!} \right) \right) \times \\
\times \left(\prod_{\alpha\in\mathcal{D}(g)} c_\alpha.\hat{y}_{g_\alpha} \right) \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kQ}\left(y\right) \Bigg)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))} \Bigg)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mathbb{1}$ is a map such that $(Q \vdash P) \subseteq \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{1}\right)$ holds and such that for each member A of $(Q \vdash P)$, $\mathbb{1}_A = 1$ holds, and $\mathbb{D}$ is the set of all members ρ of $\mathbb{R}^{(Q\vdash P)}$ such that $0 \leq \rho_A \leq 1$ holds for every member A of $(Q \vdash P)$.

We shall prove, for each ordered pair (u, m) of a member u of $\mathbb{X}\left(\downarrow\left(\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right),P\right),D\right)$ and a member m of $\mathbb{A}\left(\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right),\left(D-\xi\left(P,Q,H,u\right)+\mathbb{1}\right)\right)$, that the integrals over $\mathbb{W}$, of the term in the above formula associated with u and m, for the members k of $\mathbb{N}$, form a Cauchy sequence.

Let (P, Q) be any member of $\tilde{\mathbb{O}}\left(G,H\right)$, let u be any member of $\mathbb{X}\left(\downarrow\left(\mathbb{I}\left(Q,H\right),P\right),D\right)$, and let m be any member of $\mathbb{A}\left(\mathbb{J}\left(P,Q,H\right),\left(D-\xi\left(P,Q,H,u\right)+\mathbb{1}\right)\right)$.

We first note that in consequence of the assumed regularity of $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kQ}\left(y\right)$, we may swap the order of the ρ-integration and the x-integration, and we now do this, so that we now do the x-integrals before the ρ-integrals.

For any member E of W, we define the differential operator t_E, as on page 166, by $t_E \equiv \left(\hat{y}_j + \hat{y}_k\right)$, where j and k are the two members of E, or in other words, $E = \{j, k\}$.

For any ordered septuple (B, i, n, j, s, E, v) of a map B such that $\mathcal{D}\left(B\right)$ is finite and $\mathcal{R}\left(B\right) \subseteq \mathbb{B}\left(Q\right)$ holds, a map i such that $\mathcal{D}\left(B\right) \subseteq \mathcal{D}\left(i\right)$ holds and for each member α of $\mathcal{D}\left(B\right)$, i_α is a member of B_α, a map n such that $\mathcal{D}\left(B\right) \subseteq \mathcal{D}\left(n\right)$ holds and for each member α of $\mathcal{D}\left(B\right)$, n_α is a unit d-vector, a map j such that $\mathcal{D}\left(j\right)$ is finite and

$\mathcal{R}(j) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(V)$ holds, a map s such that $\mathcal{D}(j) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(s)$ holds and for each member β of $\mathcal{D}(j)$, s_β is a unit d-vector, a map E such that $\mathcal{D}(E)$ is finite and $\mathcal{R}(E) \subseteq W$ holds, and a map v such that $\mathcal{D}(E) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(v)$ holds and for each member γ of $\mathcal{D}(E)$, v_γ is a unit d-vector, we define, for every member k of $\mathbb{N}$, and for every member ρ of $\mathbb{D}$, (or in other words, for every member ρ of $\mathbb{R}^{(Q\vdash P)}$ such that $0 \leq \rho_A \leq 1$ holds for every member A of $(Q \vdash P)$),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\overset{\circ}{I}_k(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho) \equiv \int_{\mathbb{W}} \Bigg(\prod_{A\in(V\vdash\{O\})} d^d x_A\Bigg) \times \\
&\times\Bigg(\Bigg(\prod_{B\in(Y\vdash G)} \mathcal{E}\left((P\cap\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))),(Q\cap\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))),H,\sigma,R,\downarrow(x,\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B)))\right)\Bigg)\times \\
&\quad\times\Bigg(\Bigg(\prod_{\alpha\in\mathcal{D}(B)}\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,B_\alpha,i_\alpha)}-x_{B_\alpha}\right).n_\alpha\right)\Bigg)\Bigg(\prod_{\beta\in\mathcal{D}(j)}\left(s_\beta.\hat{y}_{j_\beta}\right)\Bigg)\Bigg(\prod_{\gamma\in\mathcal{D}(E)}\left(v_\gamma.t_{E_\gamma}\right)\Bigg)\times \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\times\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kQ}(y)\Bigg)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))}\Bigg)
\end{aligned}$$

(We note that the definition of $\overset{\circ}{I}_k(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho)$ depends implicitly on G, H, P, and Q.)

Then by introducing a complete set of d orthonormal unit d-vectors, (for example the d unit d-vectors parallel to the coordinate axes in the positive directions), we find that for each member k of $\mathbb{N}$, the term in our integral associated with the member u of $\mathbb{X}(\downarrow(\mathbb{I}(Q,H),P),D)$ and the member m of $\mathbb{A}(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H),(D-\xi(P,Q,H,u)+\mathbb{1}))$, is equal to the integral with respect to ρ, over $\mathbb{D}$, of the ρ-dependent factor

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Bigg(\prod_{A\in(Q\vdash P)}(1-\rho_A)^{(D_A-\xi_A(P,Q,H,u))}\left(D_A-\xi_A(P,Q,H,u)+1\right)\Bigg)\times \\
&\qquad\qquad\times\Bigg(\prod_{((i,A),X)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\psi(\mathbb{J}(P,Q,H))))}\Bigg(\prod_{C\in(\mathbb{G}_{iA}(Q,H)\vdash X)}\rho_C\Bigg)^{m_{iAX}}\Bigg)
\end{aligned}$$

multiplied by the sum, over a *finite* number of ordered septuples (B,i,n,j,s,E,v) as on page 171, of a finite coefficient, independent of ρ and k, times $\overset{\circ}{I}_k(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho)$, and that furthermore, and by analogy with observations 1) to 21) on pages 112 to

121, every septuple (B,i,n,j,s,E,v) that occurs in this sum satisfies the following condition:

For each member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right)$, the number of members β of $\mathcal{D}\left(j\right)$ such that $j_\beta \in \mathcal{U}\left(W\right)$ and $\left\{\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,j_\beta\right),\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,l\right)\right\} \in \mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$ both hold, where l is the other member of the unique member $\mathcal{C}\left(W,j_\beta\right)$ of W that has j_β as a member, is less than or equal to the number of members α of $\mathcal{D}\left(B\right)$ such that $B_\alpha \in \left(\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right) \vdash \mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$ holds, plus the number of members α of $\mathcal{D}\left(g\right)$ such that $g_\alpha \in \mathcal{U}\left(W\right)$ and $\left\{\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,g_\alpha\right),\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,l\right)\right\} \in \mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$ both hold, where l is the other member of the unique member $\mathcal{C}\left(W,g_\alpha\right)$ of W that has g_α as a member, plus

$$\begin{cases} \left(-\left(D_A+1\right)+\left(\sum_{C\in\left(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash V\right)}\ \sum_{(i,K)\in\mathbb{I}_C(Q,H)} u_{iK}\right)\right) & \text{if } A\in\left(Q\vdash P\right)\text{holds,} \\ \left(\left(\sum_{C\in\left(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash V\right)}\ \sum_{(i,K)\in\left(\mathbb{I}_C(Q,H)\vdash\mathbb{I}_A(Q,H)\right)} u_{iK}\right)-\left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}(A,H)}\ \sum_{K\in\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{K}(P,A,i),A)} u_{iK}\right)\right) & \\ & \text{if } A\in\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)\text{holds.} \end{cases}$$

(We recall that the map g was introduced on page 165, and occurs in the differential operator $\left(\prod_{\alpha\in\mathcal{D}(g)} c_\alpha.\hat{y}_{g_\alpha}\right)$ in the integand of the integral on page 167.)

We note that we may also assume that all septuples (B,i,n,j,s,E,v) occurring in the above sum are such that $\mathcal{D}\left(E\right)$ is equal to the empty set $\emptyset$, (so that E is equal to the empty map $\emptyset$), but we do not use this fact, except in so far as it ensures that the total number of derivatives acting on $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kQ}\left(y\right)$ in the integrand of any occurring $\overset{\circ}{I}_k\left(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho\right)$ is not greater than the integer N defined on page 166.

We shall prove that if (B,i,n,j,s,E,v) is any ordered septuple as on page 171, such that the above condition holds, and such that $\left(\#\left(\mathcal{D}\left(j\right)\right)+\#\left(\mathcal{D}\left(E\right)\right)\right)$ is not greater than the integer N defined on page 166, then the integrals with respect to ρ, over $\mathbb{D}$, of the ρ-dependent factor displayed at the bottom of page 172, times $\overset{\circ}{I}_k\left(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho\right)$, for the members k of $\mathbb{N}$, form a Cauchy sequence.

Let ρ be any member of $\mathbb{D}$, or in other words, let ρ be any member of $\mathbb{R}^{(Q\vdash P)}$ such that $0\leq\rho_A\leq 1$ holds for every member A of $(Q\vdash P)$. We define new integration variables for the integration with respect to x over $\mathbb{W}$, in two steps, as follows:

We first follow pages 127 to 130 exactly, and choose a map S such that $\mathcal{D}\left(S\right)=\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$, and such that for every member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$, S_A is a member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)$, and then define, for every member B of $\left(P\vdash\left\{\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)\right\}\right)$, $z_B\equiv\left(x_B-x_{S_A}\right)$, where A

is the *smallest* member C of $\bar{P}$ such that $B \subset C$ holds, or in other words, where $A = \mathcal{Y}\left(\overline{(P \vdash \{B\})}, B\right)$ holds, and then choose, as our first new set of integration variables, the z_B, $B \in (P \vdash (\mathcal{R}(S) \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}))$, exactly as on pages 129 and 130, and note furthermore, exactly as on pages 129 and 130, that the linear transformation to this first new set of integration variables has determinant equal to 1.

We next define a wood J of V such that $P \subseteq J$ holds and $J \cup Q$ is a wood of V, as follows. We first choose a map f such that $\mathcal{D}(f)$ is equal to $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and such that for every member A of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, f_A is a member of S_A, and we note that, since P is a member of $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$, hence for each member A of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, S_A is a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A, this definition has the immediate consequence that for every member A of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, S_A is a subset of the $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A that has f_A as a member. Then we define J to be the set whose members are the members of P plus, for each ordered pair (A, T) of a member A of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ and a $(V \cup H)$-key T of A such that T is *not* a member of V, the set $(A \vdash\uparrow(f_A, \{T\}))$, where $\uparrow(f_A, \{T\})$ is defined to be the set whose members are all the members l of A such that for every partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two nonempty parts B and C such that T intersects both B and C and T is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both B and C, l is a member of the *same* member of $\{B, C\}$ as f_A is. (We note that if A is any $(V \cup H)$-connected member of $\Xi(V)$, hence in particular if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and T is any $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V, then it follows directly from our assumptions on V and H that T is a member of W hence has exactly two members, hence by Lemma 36 there is exactly one partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two parts such that T intersects both B and C and T is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both B and C.)

To check that J and $J \cup Q$ are woods of V, we first note that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ and T is any $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V, then each $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A is either a subset of $(A \vdash\uparrow(f_A, \{T\}))$ or else does not intersect $(A \vdash\uparrow(f_A, \{T\}))$, hence by Lemma 35 (ii), Lemma 31, and page 33, $(A \vdash\uparrow(f_A, \{T\}))$ is a member of $\Xi(V)$. Hence every member of J is a member of $\Xi(V)$ hence, since V is certainly a subset of J, it remains to check that no two members of $J \cup Q$ overlap one another. Now certainly no two members of Q overlap one another. Suppose now that B is any member of Q, A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and T is any $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V. Then either $B \cap A = \emptyset$ holds or $A \subseteq B$ holds or $B \subset A$ holds, and if $B \cap A = \emptyset$ holds then $B \cap (A \vdash\uparrow(f_A, \{T\})) = \emptyset$ holds and if $A \subseteq B$ holds then $(A \vdash\uparrow(f_A, \{T\})) \subseteq B$

holds, while if $B \subset A$ holds then since Q is a member of $\mathbb{O}(G,H)$, B is a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A, hence either $B \subseteq (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ holds or $B \cap (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) = \emptyset$ holds. Now suppose that A and B are two *distinct* members of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, T is any $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V, and R is any $(V \cup H)$-key of B such that R is *not* a member of V. Then either $B \cap A = \emptyset$ holds or $A \subset B$ holds or $B \subset A$ holds, and if $B \cap A = \emptyset$ holds then $(B \vdash\uparrow (f_B, \{R\})) \cap (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) = \emptyset$ holds, and if $A \subset B$ holds then since G is an H-principal wood of V, A is a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of B, hence either $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \subseteq (B \vdash\uparrow (f_B, \{R\}))$ holds or $(B \vdash\uparrow (f_B, \{R\})) \cap (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) = \emptyset$ holds, and similarly if $B \subset A$ holds then either $(B \vdash\uparrow (f_B, \{R\})) \subseteq (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ holds or $(B \vdash\uparrow (f_B, \{R\})) \cap (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) = \emptyset$ holds. And finally suppose A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ and T and R are any two *distinct* $(V \cup H)$-keys of A such that neither T nor R is a member of V. Then by analogy with Lemma 28, with the i of Lemma 28 taken as f_A, we define a relation $\rightarrow$ among the $(V \cup H)$-keys of A as follows: if B and C are $(V \cup H)$-keys of A, then $B \rightarrow C$ holds iff there *exists* a partition of A into two nonempty parts such that C intersects both parts, C is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both parts, and B does *not* intersect the part that has f_A as a member. Then by Lemma 28 (i), at most one of $T \rightarrow R$ and $R \rightarrow T$ can hold. Suppose first that $T \rightarrow R$ holds and that $\{B, C\}$ is a partition of A into two nonempty parts such that $f_A \in B$ holds, R intersects both B and C, R is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both B and C, and T does *not* intersect B. Then it directly follows from the definition of $\uparrow (f_A, \{R\})$ that $\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}) \subseteq B$ holds, hence that $C \subseteq (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))$ holds. Now let $\{D, E\}$ be any partition of A into two nonempty parts such that $f_A \in D$ holds, T intersects both D and E, and T is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both D and E. Then since $R \neq T$ holds by assumption, R does *not* intersect both D and E. Now if $R \cap D$ was empty, then since $T \cap B$ is empty, $D \cap B$ would be empty by Lemma 26. But $D \cap B$ has the member f_A hence is nonempty, hence $R \cap E$ is empty, hence by Lemma 26, $B \cap E$ is empty, hence $B \subseteq D$ holds. Hence for every partition $\{D, E\}$ of A into two nonempty parts such that $f_A \in D$ holds, T intersects both D and E, and T is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both D and E, $B \subseteq D$ holds. Hence $B \subseteq\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})$ holds, hence $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \subseteq C$ holds, hence $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \subseteq (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))$ holds, and furthermore, since $\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}) \subseteq B$ holds and $T \cap B$ is empty, $T \cap \uparrow (f_A, \{R\})$ is empty, hence since, by Lemma 28 (viii), T *does* intersect $\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})$, $\uparrow (f_A, \{R\})$ is not equal to $\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})$, hence $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \subset (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))$ holds. And analogously, if $R \to T$ holds, then $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\})) \subset (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ holds. Now suppose, finally, that *neither* $T \to R$ *nor* $R \to T$ holds. Then for every partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two nonempty parts such that R intersects both parts and R is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both parts, T *does* intersect the part that has f_A as a member, hence since, by Lemma 28 (viii), $\{\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}), (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\}$ is such a partition of A and $f_A \in\uparrow (f_A, \{R\})$ holds, $T\cap \uparrow (f_A, \{R\})$ is nonempty, hence, since by assumption $T \neq R$ holds, $T \cap (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))$ *is* empty. And analogously, $R \cap (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ is empty. Hence by Lemma 26, $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\})) \cap (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) = \emptyset$ holds.

We next note that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, T is any $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V, and we define Z to be the set whose members are all the $(V \cup H)$-keys R of A such that $R \notin V$ and $R \to T$ both hold, where the relation $\to$ among the $(V \cup H)$-keys of A is defined as in the preceding paragraph, then the set $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R\in Z} (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\right)$, or in other words, the set $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \cap \left(\bigcap_{R\in Z} \uparrow (f_A, \{R\})\right)$, is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A, (and hence, in particular, is nonempty). For by Lemma 28 (viii), $T \cap (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ is nonempty. Let i be any member of $T \cap (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$, and let X be the set whose members are *all* the $(V \cup H)$-keys of A that are not members of V. We first note that if R is any member of X, then each $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A is either a subset of $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))$ or else does not intersect $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))$, hence each $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A is either a subset of $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R\in Z} (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\right)$ or else does not intersect $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R\in Z} (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\right)$. Now let j be any member of $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R\in Z} (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\right)$, let R be any member of X, and let $\{B, C\}$ be any partition of A into two nonempty parts such that R intersects both parts and R is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both parts, and suppose furthermore that $f_A \in B$ holds. Suppose first that R is *not* a member of Z, hence that $R \to T$ does *not* hold. Then since by Lemma 28 (viii), $\{\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}), (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))\}$ is a partition of A into two nonempty parts such that T intersects both parts and T is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both parts, and moreover f_A is a member of $\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})$, R *does* intersect $\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})$, hence either $R = T$ holds or else R does *not* intersect $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$. Suppose first that $R = T$ holds. Then since it follows directly from our assumptions on V and H that T is a member of W, hence that $\#(T) = 2$ holds, it follows directly from Lemma 36 that there is *exactly one* partition of A into two nonempty parts such that T intersects both parts and T is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both parts. Hence B is equal to $\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})$ and C is equal to $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$, hence, since $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R \in Z} (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\right)$ is a subset of $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ hence both i and j are members of $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$, i and j are members of the *same* member of $\{B, C\}$. Now suppose that R is *not* equal to T, hence that R does *not* intersect $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$, and furthermore that T does *not* intersect both B and C. Then it directly follows from Lemma 26 that one of $B \cap (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ and $C \cap (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ is empty, hence that $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ is a subset of one member of $\{B, C\}$, hence again that i and j are members of the *same* member of $\{B, C\}$. Now suppose that R *is* a member of Z, hence that $R \rightarrow T$ holds, (hence that R is *not* equal to T). We first note that by Lemma 28 (viii), $\{\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}), (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\}$ is a partition of A into two nonempty parts such that R intersects both parts and R is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both parts, hence T does *not* intersect both $\uparrow (f_A, \{R\})$ and $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))$, and furthermore R does not intersect $\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})$, for $R \rightarrow T$ implies that there exists a partition $\{D, E\}$ of A into two nonempty parts such that $f_A \in D$ holds, T intersects both parts, T is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both parts, and R does *not* intersect D, and if $\{D, E\}$ is such a partition of A, then by the definition of $\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})$, $\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}) \subseteq D$ holds, hence R does not intersect $\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})$. Hence by Lemma 26, if $T \cap \uparrow (f_A, \{R\})$ was empty, then $\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}) \cap \uparrow (f_A, \{T\})$ would be empty, but $\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}) \cap \uparrow (f_A, \{T\})$ has the member f_A hence is nonempty, hence $T \cap (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))$ is empty. Hence, since i is a member of $T \cap (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ hence is a member of T, i is *not* a member of $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))$, hence, since this is true for *all* members R of Z, i *is* a member of $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R \in Z} (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\right)$, hence $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R \in Z} (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\right)$ is nonempty. And furthermore, with R still being any member of Z, and $\{B, C\}$ being any partition of A into two nonempty parts such that $f_A \in B$ holds, R intersects both parts, and R is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both parts, it follows directly from the definition of $\uparrow (f_A, \{R\})$ that $\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}) \subseteq B$ holds, hence since, as just shown, i is a member of $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R \in Z} (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\right) = (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \cap \left(\bigcap_{R \in Z} \uparrow (f_A, \{R\})\right)$, and j is by definition a member of this set, both i and j are members of $\uparrow (f_A, \{R\})$, hence both i and j are members of B, hence both i and j are members of the same member of $\{B, C\}$. Hence for *every* member R of X, or in other words, for every $(V \cup H)$-key R of A such that R is *not* a member of V, and for every partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two nonempty parts such that R intersects both parts and R is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both parts, j is a member of the *same* member of $\{B, C\}$ as i is, hence, since this is true for *every* member j of $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R\in Z} (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\right)$, and furthermore, as shown above, i *is* a member of $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R\in Z} (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\right)$, it follows directly from Lemmas 29 and 31 that $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R\in Z} (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\right)$ is a subset of the unique $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A that has i as a member. Hence since, as noted above, each $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A is either a subset of $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R\in Z} (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\right)$ or else does not intersect this set, and by Lemma 31, distinct $(V \cup H)$-firm over V components of A do not intersect one another, $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R\in Z} (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\right)$ is *equal* to the unique $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A that has i as a member, which, in the notation of Lemma 28, is $\uparrow (i, X)$.

From now on until the end of the proof of Theorem 2, and for each member A of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, we define the relation $\rightarrow$ among the $(V \cup H)$-keys of A as in Lemma 28, with the i of Lemma 28 taken as the member f_A of A, or in other words, if T and R are any $(V \cup H)$-keys of A, then we define $R \rightarrow T$ to hold ifif there *exists* a partition $\{B, C\}$ of A into two nonempty parts such that T intersects both B and C, T is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both B and C, and R does *not* intersect the member of $\{B, C\}$ that has f_A as a member.

And from now until the end of the proof of Theorem 2 we also define, as in Lemma 28, with the set U of Lemma 28 taken as the set $(V \cup H)$, and for each member A of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and for each member i of A, and for each subset X of the set of all the $(V \cup H)$-keys of A, the set $\uparrow (i, X)$ to be the subset of A whose members are all the members j of A such that if T is any member of X, and $\{B, C\}$ is any partition of A into two nonempty parts such that T intersects both B and C and T is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both B and C, then j is a member of the *same* member of $\{B, C\}$ as i is. We note that the definition of $\uparrow (i, X)$ depends implicitly on A, and we will always make clear which member A of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ $\uparrow (i, X)$ is being defined with respect to.

We next note that it follows immediately from the foregoing that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ and T is any $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V, and if furthermore $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ is *not* a member of P, or in other words, if $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ is a member of $(J \vdash P)$, then there is at least one member B of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ such that B is a member of $\mathcal{P}(J, (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})))$ and B is a subset of the $(V \cup H)$-firm over V

component $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R\in Z} (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\right)$ of A, where Z is defined as above to be the set of all the $(V \cup H)$-keys R of A such that $R \notin V$ and $R \to T$ both hold. For if Z is nonempty then $C \equiv (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R\in Z} (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\right)$ is a *strict* subset of $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ and furthermore there is no member D of $(J \vdash P)$ such that $C \subset D \subset (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ holds, hence each of the one or more members of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ that is a subset of the $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component C of A satisfies the stated conditions on B, and if Z is empty then $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ is itself a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A, and is furthermore by assumption not a member of P, hence each of the two or more members of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ that are subsets of $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ satisfies the stated conditions on B.

We next extend the map S to the domain $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{J}\right)$ by choosing, for each ordered pair (A, T) of a member A of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ and a $(V \cup H)$-key T of A such that T is *not* a member of V and $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ is *not* a member of P, $S_{(A\vdash\uparrow(f_A,\{T\}))}$ to be a member B of $\mathcal{P}(J, (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})))$ such that B is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ that is a subset of the $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R\in Z} (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\right)$ of A, and we note that by the previous paragraph, such a B always exists.

And we note that the extended map S is such that S_A is a member of $\mathcal{P}(J, A)$ for *every* member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{J}\right)$, for this is so by construction if A is a member of $\left(\bar{J} \vdash \bar{P}\right)$, while if A is a member of $\left(\bar{P} \vdash G\right)$ then S_A is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ and no member of $(J \vdash P)$ is a member of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$, hence S_A is a member of $\mathcal{P}(J, A)$, and if A is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ then, as noted on page 173, S_A is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ that is a subset of the $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A that has f_A as a member, hence S_A is not a subset of $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ for *any* $(V \cup H)$-key T of A that is not a member of V.

We next note that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and B is any $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A such that f_A is *not* a member of B, then it follows directly from Lemma 32 that there exists a *unique* $(V \cup H)$-key T of A such T is not a member of V, T intersects B, and there exists a partition $\{D, E\}$ of A into two nonempty parts such that $f_A \in D$ holds, $B \subseteq E$ holds, T intersects both D and E, and T is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both D and E, and we note that it also follows directly from Lemma 32 that if T is this unique $(V \cup H)$-key of A, then $R \to T$ holds for every $(V \cup H)$-key R of A, different from T, such that $R \notin V$ and $R \cap B \neq \emptyset$ both hold, and $T \to R$ does not hold for *any* $(V \cup H)$-key R of A such that $R \notin V$ and $R \cap B \neq \emptyset$ both hold, and furthermore if R and $\tilde{R}$ are *any* $(V \cup H)$-keys of A such that neither

R nor $\tilde{R}$ is a member of V, both R and $\tilde{R}$ intersect B, and $R \to \tilde{R}$ holds, then $\tilde{R} = T$ holds.

We note furthermore that since it follows directly from our assumptions on V and H that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and T is any $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V, then T is a member of W hence has exactly two members, that in particular, if B is any $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A such that f_A is *not* a member of B, and T is the unique $(V \cup H)$-key of A that satisfies the conditions of the previous paragraph with reference to B, then T has exactly two members and $T \cap B$ has *exactly one member.*

If A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ and B is any $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A such that f_A is *not* a member of B, then we define the *key member of* B to be the unique member of B that is a member of T, where T is the unique $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T satisfies the conditions, with reference to B, stated in the paragraph before the previous one.

We note that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ and X is the set whose members are all the $(V \cup H)$-keys of A that are *not* members of V, then X is a subset of W hence is a partition, and no two distinct members of X intersect one another.

We note furthermore that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, T is any $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V, and Z is the set of all the $(V \cup H)$-keys R of A such that $R \notin V$ and $R \to T$ both hold, then the unique $(V \cup H)$-key of A which satisfies, with reference to the $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R \in Z} (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\right)$ of A, the conditions stated in the paragraph before the previous three, is T itself.

And we note furthermore that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, T is any $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V, and i is a member of T such that i is the key member of some $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A, then it follows directly from the definition of the key member of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A, that if $\{B, C\}$ is the unique, (by Lemma 36), partition of A into two nonempty parts such that T intersects both B and C, and T is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both B and C, then i is a member of the member of $\{B, C\}$ that does *not* have f_A as a member. Hence only one of the two members of T can be the key member of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A.

Hence if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, then for each $(V \cup H)$-key T of A such that T is *not* a member of V, there is *exactly one* $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component B of

A such that $f_A \notin B$ holds and the key member of B is a member of T. Hence the number of $(V \cup H)$-firm over V components of A is equal to one plus the number of $(V \cup H)$-keys of A that are *not* members of V.

We recall from page 25 that for any ordered pair (F, E) of a wood F, and a set E such that every member of E is a set, we define $\mathcal{O}(F, E)$ to be the set whose members are all the members i of $\mathcal{U}(F)$ such that there *exists* a member A of F such that $i \in A$ holds and there is *no* member B of E such that $i \in B$ and $B \subseteq A$ both hold, and we note that it immediately follows from page 85 that in the present case, $\mathcal{O}(J, H) = \mathcal{O}(P, H) = \mathcal{O}(Q, H) = \mathcal{O}(G, H) = \mathcal{O}(V, H)$ holds.

And we recall from page 89 that $\mathbb{G}(Q, H)$ is by definition the map whose domain is the set of all ordered pairs (i, B) of a member i of $\mathcal{O}(Q, H)$ and a member B of Q, and such that for each member (i, B) of $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{G}(Q, H))$, $\mathbb{G}_{iB}(Q, H) \equiv (\mathbb{G}(Q, H))_{(i,B)}$ is the set whose members are all the members C of Q such that $B \subseteq C$ and $C \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, i)$ both hold. (Thus $\mathbb{G}_{iB}(Q, H)$ is the empty set $\emptyset$ if $B \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, i)$ does not hold.)

Thus, in particular, if i is any member of $\mathcal{O}(V, H) = \mathcal{O}(Q, H)$, then $\mathbb{G}_{i\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}(Q, H)$ is the set whose members are all the members C of Q such that $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i) \subseteq C \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, i)$ holds, and is equal to $(\{\mathcal{Z}(P, H, i)\} \cup \mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{Z}(P, H, i), \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, i)))$.

And we recall from pages 91 and 92 that if x is any member of $\mathbb{U}_d(V, \omega)$, i is any member of $\mathcal{O}(V, H)$, and ρ is any member of $\mathbb{D}$, or in other words, ρ is any member of $\mathbb{R}^{(Q \vdash P)}$ such that $0 \leq \rho_A \leq 1$ holds for every member A of $(Q \vdash P)$, and if we define the member u of $\mathbb{R}^{\left(\mathbb{G}_{i\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}(Q,H)\right)} = \mathbb{R}^{(\{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)\} \cup \mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i)))}$ by

$$u_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)} \equiv \left(\prod_{B \in \mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i))} \rho_B \right)$$

and by

$$u_C \equiv \left(\prod_{B \in \mathbb{Y}(Q,C,\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i))} \rho_B \right) (1 - \rho_C)$$

for all $C \in \mathbb{Y}(Q, \mathcal{Z}(P, H, i), \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, i))$, then

$$\mu_i(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho)) = \sum_{C \in \left(\mathbb{G}_{i\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}(Q,H)\right)} u_C x_C$$

holds and

$$\sum_{C \in \left(\mathbb{G}_{i\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}(Q,H)\right)} u_C = 1$$

holds, and furthermore, $u_C \geq 0$ holds for all members C of $\mathbb{G}_{i\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}(Q,H)$.

Now if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, B is any $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A such that f_A is *not* a member of B, and i is the key member of B, then i is certainly a member of $\mathcal{O}(V,H)$, for since H is a partition, the *only* member of H that has i as a member is the unique $(V \cup H)$-key T of A that has i as a member and is *not* a member of V, and this $(V \cup H)$-key T of A is certainly not a subset of any member of V. And furthermore, if T is the unique $(V \cup H)$-key of A that has i as a member and is *not* a member of V, then $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)$ is the largest member of P that has i as a member but does not have T as a subset, and $\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i)$ is the largest member of Q that has i as a member but does not have T as a subset, hence, since A is a member of both P and Q that *does* have T as a subset, both $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i)$ are strict subsets of A, hence, since both P and Q are members of $\mathbb{O}(G,H)$, both $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i)$ are subsets of the $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component B of A. And furthermore, since $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i)$, which by definition is the unique member of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$ that has i as a member, is a member of P that is a strict subset of A and that intersects B, $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i)$ is a subset of B, hence T is *not* a subset of $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i)$, hence since, by the definition of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$, there is no member C of P such that $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i) \subset C \subset A$ holds, $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i)$ is the *largest* member of P that has i as a member but does not have T as a subset, hence $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i) = \mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)$ holds, and furthermore, since $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i)$ holds, $\mathcal{K}(P,A,i) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i)$ holds.

For each member C of $\mathbb{G}_{i\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}(Q,H)$, or in other words, for each member C of Q such that $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i) \subseteq C \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i)$ holds, let F_C be the set whose members are all the members D of P such that $D \subseteq C$ holds and there is *no* member E of P such that $D \subset E \subseteq C$ holds. Thus F_C is equal to $\{C\}$ if C is a member of P, or in other words, if C is equal to $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)$, and F_C is equal to $\mathcal{P}(P,C)$ if C is *not* a member of P, or in other words, if C is a member of $\mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i),\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i))$. And we also define F_B to be the set whose members are all the members D of P such that $D \subseteq B$ holds and there is *no* member E of P such that $D \subset E \subseteq B$ holds, so that F_B is equal to $\{B\}$ if B is a member of P, (in which case $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i) = \mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i) = B$ holds), and F_B is equal to $\mathcal{P}(P,B)$ if B is *not* a member of P.

Then by Lemma 4, and for each member C of $\mathbb{G}_{i\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}(Q,H)$,

$$x_C = \sum_{D \in F_C} \omega_{CD} x_D$$

holds. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_i\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right) &= \sum_{C\in\left(\mathbb{G}_{i\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}(Q,H)\right)} u_C x_C\\ &= \sum_{C\in\left(\mathbb{G}_{i\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}(Q,H)\right)} \left(u_C\sum_{D\in F_C}\omega_{CD}x_D\right)\\ &= \sum_{D\in F_B}\left(\sum_{C\in\left(\mathbb{G}_{iD}(Q,H)\cap\mathbb{G}_{i\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}(Q,H)\right)} u_C\omega_{CD}\right)x_D\end{aligned}$$

holds, where in obtaining the last line we noted that, for each member C of $\mathbb{G}_{i\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}\left(Q,H\right)$, $F_C\subseteq F_B$ holds, and furthermore, that for each member D of F_B such that $D\subseteq\mathcal{Z}\left(Q,H,i\right)$ does *not* hold, $\mathbb{G}_{iD}\left(Q,H\right)$ is the empty set $\emptyset$.

For each member D of F_B, we define

$$r_D\equiv\left(\sum_{C\in\left(\mathbb{G}_{iD}(Q,H)\cap\mathbb{G}_{i\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}(Q,H)\right)} u_C\omega_{CD}\right).$$

Then it immediately follows from the foregoing that

$$\mu_i\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)=\sum_{D\in F_B}r_Dx_D$$

holds, and furthermore that

$$\sum_{D\in F_B}r_D=1$$

holds, and furthermore that $r_D\geq 0$ holds for every member D of F_B, and furthermore that $r_D=0$ holds for every member D of F_B such that $D\subseteq\mathcal{Z}\left(Q,H,i\right)$ does *not* hold.

We next define, for each member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$, and for each ordered pair $\left(K,D\right)$ of a member K of $\left(J\vdash P\right)$ such that K is a member of $\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right)$, or in other words, a member K of $\left(J\vdash P\right)$ such that K is equal to the set $\left(A\vdash\uparrow\left(f_A,\{T\}\right)\right)$ for some $\left(V\cup H\right)$-key T of A such that T is *not* a member of V, and a member D of $\mathcal{P}\left(J,K\right)$, the real number ν_{KD} as follows. Let T be the unique $\left(V\cup H\right)$-key of A such that K is equal to $\left(A\vdash\uparrow\left(f_A,\{T\}\right)\right)$. (We note that by Lemma 28 (viii), T may be identified as the unique $\left(V\cup H\right)$-key of A that intersects both K and $\left(A\vdash K\right)$.) Let B be equal to the $\left(V\cup H\right)$-firm over V component $\left(A\vdash\uparrow\left(f_A,\{T\}\right)\right)\vdash\left(\bigcup_{R\in Z}\left(A\vdash\uparrow\left(f_A,\{R\}\right)\right)\right)$ of A, (where Z is the set of all the $\left(V\cup H\right)$-keys R of A such that $R\notin V$ and $R\rightarrow T$

both hold), or in other words, let B be the unique $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A whose key member is a member of T. Let i be the key member of B, and let the set F_B be defined as above to be the set whose members are all the members D of P such that $D \subseteq B$ holds and there is *no* member E of P such that $D \subset E \subseteq B$ holds, so that F_B is equal to $\{B\}$ if B is a member of P, and F_B is equal to $\mathcal{P}(P, B)$ if B is *not* a member of P. We note that $\mathcal{P}(J, K)$ is equal to the set whose members are the members of F_B, together with, for each $(V \cup H)$-key R of A such that the three conditions $R \notin V$, $R \to T$, and $R \cap B \neq \emptyset$ all hold, (if there *are* any such $(V \cup H)$-keys R of A), the set $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))$. Then for $D \in \mathcal{P}(J, K)$, we define ν_{KD} to be equal to 0 if D is *not* a member of F_B, while if D *is* a member of F_B, then we define ν_{KD} to be equal to r_D, where r_D was defined, with reference to the key member i of B, on page 183. (Thus ν_{KD} depends on ρ through the coefficients u_C, $C \in \left(\mathbb{G}_{iD}(Q, H) \cap \mathbb{G}_{i\mathcal{Z}(P,H,i)}(Q, H)\right)$.) We note that it follows immediately from this definition that $\sum_{D \in \mathcal{P}(J,K)} \nu_{KD} = 1$ holds, and that ν_{KD} is equal to 0 unless D is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, (hence in particular, ν_{KD} is equal to 0 if D is a member of $(J \vdash P)$), and furthermore, that

$$\mu_i(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho)) = \sum_{D \in \mathcal{P}(J,K)} \nu_{KD} x_D = \sum_{D \in F_B} \nu_{KD} x_D$$

holds, where i is the key member of B.

We next extend the definition of z over $(J \vdash \{\mathcal{U}(V)\})$ by defining, for each member K of $(J \vdash P)$:

$$z_K \equiv \sum_{D \in \mathcal{P}(J,K)} \nu_{KD} z_D.$$

We note that this is actually a direct, rather than inductive, definition, due to ν_{KD} being equal to 0 for $D \in (J \vdash P)$, and we also note that it directly follows from the definition of J on pages 173 and 174 that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is *not* a member of $(J \vdash P)$.

Finally we complete the second step, started on page 173, in the definition of our new integration variables as follows.

For each member B of $(J \vdash \{\mathcal{U}(V)\})$ such that B is *not* a member of $J \cap (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A)) \vdash \{A\})$ for some member A of the subset $\mathbb{B}(G)$ of P, we define $a_B \equiv z_B$.

And for each member A of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and for each member B of $J \cap (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A)) \vdash \{A\})$, we define $a_B \equiv (z_B - z_{S_C})$, where C is the *smallest* member of J to contain B as a *strict* subset. (We recall that the map S was extended to the domain $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{J}\right)$ on pages 178 and 179.) We note that if the smallest member of J to contain B as a strict subset is in fact A, (which occurs when B is equal to $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$, where T is a $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that $T \notin V$ holds and T *does* intersect the unique $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A that has f_A as a member and contains S_A as a subset), then since $z_{S_A} = 0$ holds, $a_B = z_B$ holds.

We choose as our new set of integration variables the a_B, $B \in (J \vdash (\mathcal{R}(S) \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}))$, and we note that, exactly as on pages 129 and 130, the transformation to this new set of integration variables may be expressed as a sequence of transformations of the type considered in Lemma 24, hence the linear transformation to this new set of integration variables has determinant equal to 1.

Now for each member l of $\mathcal{U}(V)$ we have, exactly as on page 129, that

$$x_{\mathcal{C}(V,l)} = x_{\mathcal{U}(V)} + \sum_{A \in \mathbb{Y}\left(\bar{P}, \mathcal{C}(V,l), \mathcal{U}(V)\right)} \left(z_{\mathcal{K}(P,A,l)} - \sum_{C \in \mathcal{P}(P,A)} \omega_{AC} z_C \right)$$

holds, and furthermore, if L is any member of P, and l is any member of L, that

$$x_L = x_{\mathcal{U}(V)} + \sum_{A \in \mathbb{Y}\left(\bar{P}, L, \mathcal{U}(V)\right)} \left(z_{\mathcal{K}(P,A,l)} - \sum_{C \in \mathcal{P}(P,A)} \omega_{AC} z_C \right)$$

holds.

And furthermore in these equations, exactly as on pages 129 and 130, $x_{\mathcal{U}(V)}$ may be expressed in terms of the z variables by use of the particular equation of the above form for $x_{\mathcal{C}(V,h)}$, where h is the particular member of $\mathcal{U}(V)$ such that $x_{\mathcal{C}(V,h)}$ has the fixed value b in the definition of the integration domain $\mathbb{W}$.

Now let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and K be any member of $J \cap (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P,A)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(P,A))$. Then

$$\sum_{D \in \mathcal{P}(J,K)} \nu_{KD} a_D = \sum_{D \in \mathcal{P}(J,K)} \nu_{KD} \left(z_D - z_{S_K} \right) = \left(z_K - z_{S_K} \right)$$

holds, hence $z_{S_K} = z_K - \sum_{D \in \mathcal{P}(J,K)} \nu_{KD} a_D$ holds, hence for all members D of $\mathcal{P}(J,K)$ we have

$$z_D = a_D + z_{S_K} = z_K + \left(a_D - \sum_{C \in \mathcal{P}(J,K)} \nu_{KC} a_C \right).$$

For each member A of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ we now define, for each member D of $J \cap (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P,A)) \vdash \{A\})$, M_D to be the *largest* member of J that contains D as a subset and is a *strict* subset of A. Thus M_D is equal to $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))$, where R is the unique $(V \cup H)$-key of A that satisfies the three conditions that R is *not* a member of V, that R *does* intersect the unique $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A that has f_A as a member, and that $D \subseteq (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))$ holds. (We recall that by Lemma 28 (x) and Lemma 28 (xi), A is equal to the disjoint union of the unique $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A that has f_A as a member, together with the sets $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ for all the $(V \cup H)$-keys T of A such that T intersects the unique $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A that has f_A as a member and T is *not* a member of V.)

Then if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, D is any member of $J \cap (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A)) \vdash \{A\})$, and l is any member of D, it immediately follows from the foregoing, together with the fact that $z_{S_A} = 0$ holds, hence that $a_{M_D} = z_{M_D}$ holds, that

$$z_D = a_{M_D} + \sum_{K \in \mathbb{Y}(J, D, M_D)} \left(a_{\mathcal{K}(J,K,l)} - \sum_{C \in \mathcal{P}(J,K)} \nu_{KC} a_C \right)$$

holds. And this is true in particular for any member D of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$. Hence the expressions for the x_L, $L \in P$, in terms of the variables a_B, $B \in (J \vdash (\mathcal{R}(S) \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}))$, may be obtained by substituting into the expressions on page 184 the equations above for all members D of P such that D is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ for some member A of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, together with the equations $z_D = a_D$ for the members D of $(P \vdash \{\mathcal{U}(V)\})$ such that D is *not* a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ for any member A of $\mathbb{B}(G)$.

We now make the following observations:

30) Let A be any member of $\bar{P}$, L be any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, and l be any member of L. Then x_L is equal to z_L plus a term x_{S_A} that is the same for *all* members D of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$. For by page 184 we have that

$$x_L = x_{\mathcal{U}(V)} + \left(\sum_{N \in \mathbb{Y}\left(\bar{P}, A, \mathcal{U}(V)\right)} \left(z_{\mathcal{K}(P,N,l)} - \sum_{C \in \mathcal{P}(P,N)} \omega_{NC} z_C \right) \right) + \left(z_{\mathcal{K}(P,A,l)} - \sum_{C \in \mathcal{P}(P,A)} \omega_{AC} z_C \right)$$

holds, and the *only* term that differs for different members L of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ is the term $z_{\mathcal{K}(P,A,l)}$, which is equal to z_L.

31) Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, T be any $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V, B be equal to $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$, and L be any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$.

Then the coefficient of a_B in z_L is equal to 1 if $L \subseteq B$ holds, and equal to 0 otherwise. For if l is any member of L, then by page 185 we have that

$$z_L = a_{M_L} + \sum_{K \in \mathbb{Y}(J,L,M_L)} \left(a_{\mathcal{K}(J,K,l)} - \sum_{C \in \mathcal{P}(J,K)} \nu_{KC} a_C \right)$$

holds. And furthermore it follows directly from the definition, on pages 183 and 184, of the real numbers ν_{KC}, for each ordered pair (K,C) of a member K of $(J \vdash P) \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\right)$ and a member C of $\mathcal{P}(J,K)$, that $\nu_{KC} = 0$ holds if C is equal to $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))$ for any $(V \cup H)$-key R of A such that R is not a member of V, hence a_B does not occur in the term $\sum_{C \in \mathcal{P}(J,K)} \nu_{KC} a_C$ for any member K of $\mathbb{Y}(J,L,M_L)$. And the remaining terms in z_L comprise the sum $\sum_{D \in X} a_D$, where X is the set whose members are all the members D of J such that $L \subseteq D \subseteq M_L$ holds, and a_B occurs in this sum with coefficient 1 if $L \subseteq B$ holds, and with coefficient 0 otherwise.

32) Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, T be any $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V, B be equal to $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$, and L be any member of $(P \vdash \mathcal{P}(P,A))$. Then the coefficient of a_B in z_L is equal to 0. This follows directly from the above formula for z_L.

We shall now prove that if (B,i,n,j,s,E,v) is any ordered septuple as on page 171, such that the condition on page 172 holds, and such that $(\#(\mathcal{D}(j)) + \#(\mathcal{D}(E)))$ is not greater than the integer N defined on page 166, then there exists a finite collection of ordered septuples $\left(\tilde{B},\tilde{i},\tilde{n},\tilde{j},\tilde{s},\tilde{E},\tilde{v}\right)$ as on page 171, each satisfying the condition on page 172, and each satisfying the requirement that $\left(\#\left(\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{j}\right)\right) + \#\left(\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{E}\right)\right)\right)$ is not greater than the integer N defined on page 166, and each satisfying the further requirement that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and $T \equiv \{l,m\}$ is any $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V, then there is *no* member β of $\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{j}\right)$ such that $\tilde{j}_\beta = l$ holds and there is *no* member β of $\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{j}\right)$ such that $\tilde{j}_\beta = m$ holds, such that for each member k of $\mathbb{N}$, $\overset{\circ}{I}_k(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho)$ is equal to the sum, over this finite collection of septuples $\left(\tilde{B},\tilde{i},\tilde{n},\tilde{j},\tilde{s},\tilde{E},\tilde{v}\right)$, of $\overset{\circ}{I}_k\left(\tilde{B},\tilde{i},\tilde{n},\tilde{j},\tilde{s},\tilde{E},\tilde{v},\rho\right)$ times a finite real-number coefficient that is *independent of* k, and either independent of ρ or else equal to the sum of a finite number of terms, each of which is the product of finite powers, all ≥ 0 and independent of k and ρ, of the ρ_C, $C \in (Q \vdash P)$.

We first note that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and $T \equiv \{l,m\}$ is any $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V, then T is a member of W, and furthermore, by pages 179 and 180, *exactly one* of the two members l and m of T is the key member of some $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A that does not have f_A as a member.

If (B, i, n, j, s, E, v) is an ordered septuple as on page 171, such that the condition on page 172 holds, and such that $(\#(\mathcal{D}(j)) + \#(\mathcal{D}(E)))$ is not greater than the integer N defined on page 166, we begin by expressing, for each member l of $\mathcal{U}(W)$ such that for some member A of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, $\mathcal{C}(W, l)$, (or in other words, the unique member of W that has l as a member), is a $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that $\mathcal{C}(W, l)$ is *not* a member of V, and l is the member of $\mathcal{C}(W, l)$ that is *not* the key member of any $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A that does not have f_A as a member, $\hat{y}_l$ as $\hat{y}_l = (\hat{y}_l + \hat{y}_m) - \hat{y}_m = t_{\mathcal{C}(W,l)} - \hat{y}_m$, where m is the other member of $\mathcal{C}(W, l)$, and thus *is* the key member of the $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{\mathcal{C}(W, l)\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R \in Z} (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\right)$ of A, where Z is the set whose members are all the $(V \cup H)$-keys R of A such that $R \notin V$ and $R \to \mathcal{C}(W, l)$ both hold, and the differential operator t_D was defined on pages 166 and 171, for each member D of W, to be equal to $(\hat{y}_n + \hat{y}_o)$, where n and o are the two members of D, or in other words, where $D = \{n, o\}$ holds. We do this for every member β of $\mathcal{D}(j)$ such that j_β is equal to such a member l of $\mathcal{U}(W)$, thus showing, for each member k of $\mathbb{N}$ and for each member ρ of $\mathbb{D}$, that $\overset{\circ}{I}_k(B, i, n, j, s, E, v, \rho)$ is equal to the sum, over a finite collection of septuples $\left(\tilde{B}, \tilde{i}, \tilde{n}, \tilde{j}, \tilde{s}, \tilde{E}, \tilde{v}\right)$ as on page 171, each satisfying the condition on page 172, and each satisfying the requirement that $\left(\#\left(\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{j}\right)\right) + \#\left(\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{E}\right)\right)\right)$ is not greater than the integer N defined on page 166, and each satisfying the further requirement that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and $T \equiv \{l, m\}$ is any $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V, and l is the member of T that is *not* the key member of some $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A that does not have f_A as a member, then there is *no* member β of $\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{j}\right)$ such that $\tilde{j}_\beta = l$ holds, of $\overset{\circ}{I}_k\left(\tilde{B}, \tilde{i}, \tilde{n}, \tilde{j}, \tilde{s}, \tilde{E}, \tilde{v}, \rho\right)$ times a finite integer coefficient, (positive or negative), that is independent of k and independent of ρ.

Now let (B, i, n, j, s, E, v) be any ordered septuple as on page 171, such that the condition on page 172 holds, and such that $(\#(\mathcal{D}(j)) + \#(\mathcal{D}(E)))$ is not greater than the integer N defined on page 166, and such that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, T is any $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V, and l is the member of T that is *not* the key member of any $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A that does not have f_A as a member, then there is *no* member β of $\mathcal{D}(j)$ such that $j_\beta = l$ holds.

Let A be any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, let T be any $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V, let m be the member of T that *is* the key member of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A that does not have f_A as a member, (so that, specifically, m is the key member of the $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R\in Z} (A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{R\}))\right)$ of A, where Z is the set whose members are all the $(V \cup H)$-keys R of A such that $R \notin V$ and $R \to T$ both hold), and let β be any member of $\mathcal{D}(j)$ such that $j_\beta = m$ holds.

Let $\tilde{j}$ be the map whose domain is equal to $(\mathcal{D}(j) \vdash \{\beta\})$, and such that for each member γ of $\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{j}\right)$, $\tilde{j}_\gamma = j_\gamma$ holds, (so that $\tilde{j}$ is equal to $(j \vdash \{(\beta, j_\beta)\}) = (j \vdash \{(\beta, m)\})$).

Let C be the member $(A \vdash\uparrow (f_A, \{T\}))$ of J. We note that it directly follows from the fact that, by page 173, S_A is a subset of the $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A that has f_A as a member, and from the fact that, by pages 178 and 179, C is *not* equal to S_D for any member D of $(J \vdash P)$, that C is a member of $(J \vdash (\mathcal{R}(S) \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}))$, hence that by page 184, a_C is one of our new independent integration variables.

Then it directly follows from our assumptions on $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, that for any member k of $\mathbb{N}$, and for any member ρ of $\mathbb{D}$, the integral over $\mathbb{W}$, of $\hat{a}_C$ acting on the integrand of $\mathring{I}_k\left(B, i, n, \tilde{j}, s, E, v, \rho\right)$, is equal to 0, or in other words, that

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 = \int_{\mathbb{W}} \left(\prod_{D\in(V\vdash\{O\})} d^d x_D \right) \times \\
\times \Bigg(\hat{a}_C \Bigg(\Bigg(\prod_{B\in(Y\vdash G)} \mathcal{E}((P\cap\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))),(Q\cap\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B))),H,\sigma,R,\downarrow(x,\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,B)))) \Bigg) \times \\
\times \Bigg(\left(\prod_{\alpha\in\mathcal{D}(B)} \left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,B_\alpha,i_\alpha)} - x_{B_\alpha}\right).n_\alpha \right) \right) \left(\prod_{\beta\in\mathcal{D}(\tilde{j})} \left(s_\beta.\hat{y}_{\tilde{j}_\beta}\right)\right) \times \\
\times \left(\prod_{\gamma\in\mathcal{D}(E)} (v_\gamma.t_{E_\gamma}) \right) \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kQ}(y) \Bigg)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))} \Bigg) \Bigg)
\end{aligned}
$$

holds.

We now make the following observations:

33) When we substitute the expressions on pages 185 and 186 for the z_L variables, $L \in (P \vdash (\mathcal{R}(S) \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}))$, in terms of the a_D variables, $D \in (J \vdash (\mathcal{R}(S) \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}))$, into the expressions on page 184 for the x_L variables in terms of the z_D variables, the only terms in the sums over $A \in \mathbb{Y}\left(\bar{P}, \mathcal{C}\left(V,l\right), \mathcal{U}\left(V\right)\right)$ and $A \in \mathbb{Y}\left(\bar{P}, L, \mathcal{U}\left(V\right)\right)$, in the expressions on page 184 for $x_{\mathcal{C}(V,l)}$ and x_L, that get altered more than simply by re-writing each letter "z" as the letter "a", are the terms where A is a member of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$. This follows directly from the formula on page 185 for the z_D variables in terms of the a_L variables when D is a member of $J \cap \left(\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right) \vdash \left\{A\right\}\right)$ for some member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$, together with the fact that, as defined on page 184, if D is any member of $\left(J \vdash \left\{\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)\right\}\right)$ such that D is *not* a member of $J \cap \left(\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,A\right)\right) \vdash \left\{A\right\}\right)$ for some member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$, then $a_D \equiv z_D$ holds.

34) Let D be any member of $\left(Y \vdash G\right)$. Then

$$\mathcal{E}\left(\left(P \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,D\right)\right)\right), \left(Q \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,D\right)\right)\right), H, \sigma, R, \downarrow\left(x, \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,D\right)\right)\right)\right)$$

is completely independent of a_C, (where C is as defined on page 188), hence

$$\hat{a}_C \mathcal{E}\left(\left(P \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,D\right)\right)\right), \left(Q \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,D\right)\right)\right), H, \sigma, R, \downarrow\left(x, \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,D\right)\right)\right)\right)$$

is identically equal to 0. For the expression

$$\mathcal{E}\left(\left(P \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,D\right)\right)\right), \left(Q \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,D\right)\right)\right), H, \sigma, R, \downarrow\left(x, \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,D\right)\right)\right)\right)$$

depends on x only through differences $\left(x_K - x_L\right)$, where both K and L are members of $\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,D\right)\right)$, and by observations 30) to 33) above, a_C occurs with the *same* coefficient in x_K for every member K of $\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,D\right)\right)$, hence every such difference is completely independent of a_C.

35) Let D be any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right)$ such that D is *not* a member of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$, and let l be any member of D. Then the expression $\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,D,l)} - x_D\right)$ is completely independent of a_C, where C is defined as on page 188, hence $\hat{a}_C\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,D,l)} - x_D\right)$ is equal to 0. For if D is a subset of the member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$ with respect to which C was defined on page 188, then D is a strict subset of A, hence since Q is a member of $\mathbb{O}\left(G,H\right)$, D is a subset of some $\left(V \cup H\right)$-firm over V component of A. Hence the independence of $\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,D,l)} - x_D\right)$ from a_C follows directly from observations 30) to 33) above, together with the fact that both $x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,D,l)}$ and x_D are linear combinations, with coefficients summing to 1, of the x_K, $K \in \mathcal{P}\left(P,D\right)$.

36) Let D be any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$ and l be any member of D. Then $\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,D,l)} - x_D\right)$

is independent of a_C, where C is defined as on page 188, unless D is equal to A, where A is the member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ with reference to which C was defined on page 188, and if D *is* equal to A, then $\hat{a}_C \left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,D,l)} - x_D\right)$ is equal to the sum of a finite number of terms, each of which has the form of a finite real-number coefficient times the product of finite powers, all ≥ 0, of the ρ_K, $K \in (Q \vdash P)$. For it directly follows from observations 30) to 33) above, together with the fact that if D is not equal to A, then either $D \cap A = \emptyset$ holds, or $D \subset A$ holds, in which case D is a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A, (since G is an H-principal wood of V), or $A \subset D$ holds, in which case A is a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of D, that $\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,D,l)} - x_D\right)$ is independent of a_C unless D is equal to A. And if D *is* equal to A, then since both $x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,D,l)}$ and x_D are linear combinations, with ρ-independent coefficients, of the x_K, $K \in \mathcal{P}(P, A)$, and these x_K are expressed in terms of the a_L variables by the formulae on pages 184 to 186, the only ρ-dependence of the expressions for $x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,D,l)}$ and x_D in terms of the a_L variables is through the ν_{KL} coefficients, whose only ρ-dependence, by pages 183 and 184, is through the r_L coefficients, whose only ρ-dependence, by page 183, is through the u_N coefficients, whose only ρ-dependence, by page 181, is through the sum of a finite number, (in fact, at the most, two), of terms, each of which has the form of a product of finite powers, all ≥ 0, of the ρ_R, $R \in (Q \vdash P)$.

37) From observations 35) and 36) above it immediately follows that the action of $\hat{a}_C$, where C is defined as on page 188, on the factor $\left(\prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{D}(B)} \left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,B_\alpha,i_\alpha)} - x_{B_\alpha}\right) . n_\alpha\right)\right)$ in the integrand of $\overset{\circ}{I}_k \left(B, i, n, \tilde{j}, s, E, v, \rho\right)$, is equal to the sum of a finite number of terms, each of which has the form of a finite real number, independent of k and ρ, times a product of finite powers, all ≥ 0 and independent of k and ρ, of the ρ_R, $R \in (Q \vdash P)$, times $\overset{\circ}{I}_k \left(\tilde{B}, \tilde{i}, \tilde{n}, \tilde{j}, s, E, v, \rho\right)$, for some ordered septuple $\left(\tilde{B}, \tilde{i}, \tilde{n}, \tilde{j}, s, E, v\right)$ as on page 171, such that the condition on page 172 holds, and such that $\left(\tilde{B}, \tilde{i}, \tilde{n}, \tilde{j}, s, E, v\right)$ differs from $\left(B, i, n, \tilde{j}, s, E, v\right)$ at most in the first three components.

38) With the definitions of page 188, let l be the member of T that is *not* the key member of any $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A that does not have f_A as a member, (so that T is equal to $\{l, m\}$), and let $\{r, s\}$ be any member of W such that $\{r, s\}$ is *not* equal to T. Then

$$\hat{a}_C \mu_r \left(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}\left(P, Q, H, \rho\right)\right) = \hat{a}_C \mu_s \left(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}\left(P, Q, H, \rho\right)\right)$$

holds, and moreover $\hat{a}_C\mu_r\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)$ is equal to a Kronecker delta in the undisplayed $\mathbb{E}_d$ indices, times the sum of a finite number of terms, each of which has the form of a finite real number, independent of ρ, times a product of finite powers, all ≥ 0 and independent of ρ, of the ρ_K, $K\in(Q\vdash P)$.

And furthermore

$$\hat{a}_C\mu_m\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)=1+\hat{a}_C\mu_l\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)$$

holds, where the 1 displayed in the right-hand side is to be understood to be multiplied by a Kronecker delta in the undisplayed $\mathbb{E}_d$ indices, and moreover $\hat{a}_C\mu_l\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)$ is equal to a Kronecker delta in the undislayed $\mathbb{E}_d$ indices, times the sum of a finite number of terms, each of which has the form of a finite real number, independent of ρ, times a product of finite powers, all ≥ 0 and independent of ρ, of the $\rho_K, K\in(Q\vdash P)$.

For if v is any member of $\mathcal{U}\left(W\right)$ then v is certainly a member of $\mathcal{O}\left(V,H\right)$, hence by pages 91, 92, and 181, $\mu_v\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)$ is a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of the x_D, $D\in\mathbb{G}_{v\mathcal{Z}(P,H,v)}\left(Q,H\right)$, or in other words, of the x_D for the members D of Q such that $\mathcal{Z}\left(P,H,v\right)\subseteq D\subseteq\mathcal{Z}\left(Q,H,v\right)$ holds, and each coefficient in this sum has the form of the sum of a finite number, (in fact, at the most, two) of terms, each of which has the form of a finite real number, (in fact, $+1$ or -1), times a product of finite powers, independent of ρ, of the ρ_K, $K\in(Q\vdash P)$.

We recall from page 25 that $\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)$ is by definition the subset of A whose members are all the members e of A such that there is *no* member R of H such that $e\in R$ and $R\subseteq A$ both hold. And we recall from page 165 that H is a partition such that if R is any member of H such that R intersects *more* than one member of V, then R has *exactly* two members, and furthermore that W is the subset of H whose members are all the members R of H such that R intersects exactly two members of V, so that W is a partition such that every member of W has exactly two members.

Now if v is any member of $\mathcal{U}\left(W\right)$, then exactly one of the four possibilities $v\in(C\vdash\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right))$, $v\in((A\vdash C)\vdash\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right))$, $v\in\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right)$, and $v\in(\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)\vdash A)$ holds.

Suppose first that $v\in(C\vdash\mathcal{T}\left(A,H\right))$ holds. (We note that this case includes, in particular, the case $v=m$.) Then v is a member of C such that there exists a member R of H such that $v\in R$ and $R\subseteq A$ both hold. Hence $\mathcal{Z}\left(Q,H,v\right)\subset A$ holds, hence $\mathcal{Z}\left(Q,H,v\right)\subseteq C$ holds, since $Q\in\mathbb{O}\left(G,H\right)$ and $\mathcal{Z}\left(Q,H,v\right)\subset A$ imply together that $\mathcal{Z}\left(Q,H,v\right)$ is a subset of some $(V\cup H)$-firm over V component of A, and each $(V\cup H)$-

firm over V component of A is either a subset of C or else does not intersect C, and $\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,v)\cap C$ has the member v hence is nonempty. And the fact that $\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,v)\subseteq C$ holds implies immediately that *every* member D of $\mathbb{G}_{v\mathcal{Z}(P,H,v)}(Q,H)$, or in other words, every member D of Q such that $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,v)\subseteq D\subseteq\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,v)$ holds, is a subset of C. Hence it immediately follows from observations 30) to 33) above, together with the fact that if $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,v)\subset\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,v)$ holds, then for every member D of Q such that $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,v)\subseteq D\subseteq\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,v)$ holds, x_D is by Lemma 4 a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of the x_L, $L\in\mathcal{P}(P,\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,v))$, that if D is any member of Q such that $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,v)\subseteq D\subseteq\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,v)$ holds, then x_D is equal to $(a_C+x_{S_A})$ plus a term that is independent of a_C. Hence $\mu_v(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))$ is itself equal to $(a_C+x_{S_A})$ plus a term that is independent of a_C.

Suppose now that $v\in((A\vdash C)\vdash\mathcal{T}(A,H))$ holds. (We note that this case includes, in particular, the case $v=l$.) Then v is a member of $(A\vdash C)$ such that there exists a member R of H such that $v\in R$ and $R\subseteq A$ both hold. Hence $\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,v)\subset A$ holds, hence $\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,v)\subseteq(A\vdash C)$ holds, since $Q\in\mathbb{O}(G,H)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,v)\subset A$ imply together that $\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,v)$ is a subset of some $(V\cup H)$-firm over V component of A, and each $(V\cup H)$-firm over V component of A is either a subset of $(A\vdash C)$ or else does not intersect $(A\vdash C)$, and $\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,v)\cap(A\vdash C)$ has the member v hence is nonempty. And the fact that $\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,v)\subseteq(A\vdash C)$ holds implies immediately that *every* member D of $\mathbb{G}_{v\mathcal{Z}(P,H,v)}(Q,H)$, or in other words, every member D of Q such that $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,v)\subseteq D\subseteq\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,v)$ holds, is a subset of $(A\vdash C)$. Hence it immediately follows from observations 30) to 33) above, together with the fact that if $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,v)\subset\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,v)$ holds, then for every member D of Q such that $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,v)\subseteq D\subseteq\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,v)$ holds, x_D is by Lemma 4 a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of the x_L, $L\in\mathcal{P}(P,\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,v))$, that if D is any member of Q such that $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,v)\subseteq D\subseteq\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,v)$ holds, then x_D is equal to x_{S_A} plus a term that is independent of a_C. Hence $\mu_v(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))$ is itself equal to x_{S_A} plus a term that is independent of a_C.

Now suppose that $v\in\mathcal{T}(A,H)$ holds. Then v is a member of A such that there is *no* member R of H such that $v\in R$ and $R\subseteq A$ both hold. Hence $A\subseteq\mathcal{Z}(P,H,v)$ holds, hence *no* member D of $\mathbb{G}_{v\mathcal{Z}(P,H,v)}(Q,H)$ is a strict subset of A, hence it immediately follows from observations 30) to 33) above that for every member D of $\mathbb{G}_{v\mathcal{Z}(P,H,v)}(Q,H)$, x_D is equal to $x_{\mathcal{U}(V)}$ plus a term that is independent of a_C, hence $\mu_v(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))$ is itself equal to $x_{\mathcal{U}(V)}$ plus a term that is independent of

a_C.

And finally suppose that $v \in (\mathcal{U}(V) \vdash A)$ holds. Then $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,v) \subset A$ certainly does *not* hold, hence again *no* member D of $\mathbb{G}_{v\mathcal{Z}(P,H,v)}(Q,H)$ is a strict subset of A, hence again, for every member D of $\mathbb{G}_{v\mathcal{Z}(P,H,v)}(Q,H)$, x_D is equal to $x_{\mathcal{U}(V)}$ plus a term that is independent of a_C, hence $\mu_v(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))$ is itself equal to $x_{\mathcal{U}(V)}$ plus a term that is independent of a_C.

Now let $\{r,s\}$ be any member of W.

Suppose first that $r \in (C \vdash \mathcal{T}(A,H))$ holds. Then either $r = m$ holds, (in which case $s = l$ holds and $\{r,s\}$ is equal to T), or else s is *also* a member of $(C \vdash \mathcal{T}(A,H))$. Hence if $r \in (C \vdash \mathcal{T}(A,H))$ holds and $\{r,s\}$ is *not* equal to T, then it immediately follows from the foregoing that

$$\hat{a}_C\mu_r(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho)) = \hat{a}_C\mu_s(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))$$

holds, and moreover that $\hat{a}_C\mu_r(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))$ is equal to a Kronecker delta in the undisplayed $\mathbb{E}_d$ indices, times the sum of a finite number of terms, each of which has the form of a finite real number, independent of ρ, times a product of finite powers, all ≥ 0 and independent of ρ, of the ρ_K, $K \in (Q \vdash P)$.

Now suppose that $r \in ((A \vdash C) \vdash \mathcal{T}(A,H))$ holds. Then either $r = l$ holds, (in which case $s = m$ holds and $\{r,s\}$ is equal to T), or else s is *also* a member of $((A \vdash C) \vdash \mathcal{T}(A,H))$. Hence if $r \in ((A \vdash C) \vdash \mathcal{T}(A,H))$ holds and $\{r,s\}$ is *not* equal to T, then again it immediately follows from the foregoing that

$$\hat{a}_C\mu_r(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho)) = \hat{a}_C\mu_s(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))$$

holds, and moreover that $\hat{a}_C\mu_r(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))$ is equal to a Kronecker delta in the undisplayed $\mathbb{E}_d$ indices, times the sum of a finite number of terms, each of which has the form of a finite real number, independent of ρ, times a product of finite powers, all ≥ 0 and independent of ρ, of the ρ_K, $K \in (Q \vdash P)$.

Now suppose that r is either a member of $\mathcal{T}(A,H)$ or else is a member of $(\mathcal{U}(V) \vdash A)$. Then if r is a member of $\mathcal{T}(A,H)$, s is a member of $(\mathcal{U}(V) \vdash A)$, while if r is a member of $(\mathcal{U}(V) \vdash A)$, then s is either a member of $\mathcal{T}(A,H)$ or else is a member of $(\mathcal{U}(V) \vdash A)$. Hence if r is either a member of $\mathcal{T}(A,H)$ or else is a member of $(\mathcal{U}(V) \vdash A)$, then it again immediately follows from the foregoing that

$$\hat{a}_C\mu_r(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho)) = \hat{a}_C\mu_s(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))$$

holds, and moreover that $\hat{a}_C \mu_r \left(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X} \left(P, Q, H, \rho\right)\right)$ is equal to a Kronecker delta in the undisplayed $\mathbb{E}_d$ indices, times the sum of a finite number of terms, each of which has the form of a finite real number, independent of ρ, times a product of finite powers, all ≥ 0 and independent of ρ, of the ρ_K, $K \in (Q \vdash P)$.

And finally we note that m is a member of $(C \vdash \mathcal{T}(A, H))$ and l is a member of $((A \vdash C) \vdash \mathcal{T}(A, H))$, hence it immediately follows from the foregoing that

$$\hat{a}_C \mu_m \left(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X} \left(P, Q, H, \rho\right)\right) = 1 + \hat{a}_C \mu_l \left(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X} \left(P, Q, H, \rho\right)\right)$$

holds, where the 1 displayed in the right-hand side is to be understood to be multiplied by a Kronecker delta in the undisplayed $\mathbb{E}_d$ indices, and moreover that $\hat{a}_C \mu_l \left(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X} \left(P, Q, H, \rho\right)\right)$ is equal to a Kronecker delta in the undisplayed $\mathbb{E}_d$ indices, times the sum of a finite number of terms, each of which has the form of a finite real number, independent of ρ, times a product of finite powers, all ≥ 0 and independent of ρ, of the ρ_K, $K \in (Q \vdash P)$.

39) With the definitions of page 188,

$$\hat{a}_C \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kQ} \left(\mu \left(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X} \left(P, Q, H, \rho\right)\right)\right) = \hat{a}_C \left(\left(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kQ}(y)\right)_{y = \mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))}\right)$$

is equal to

$$\left(\left(\hat{y}_m \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kQ}(y)\right)_{y = \mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))}\right)$$

plus the sum, over the members R of W, of a finite coefficient times

$$\left(\left(t_R \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kQ}(y)\right)_{y = \mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))}\right),$$

where for each member R of W, the finite coefficient is equal to the sum of a finite number of terms, each of which has the form of a finite real number, independent of x and ρ, times a product of finite powers, all ≥ 0 and independent of x and ρ, of the ρ_K, $K \in (Q \vdash P)$, and, as defined on pages 166 and 171, t_R is the differential operator $t_R \equiv (\hat{y}_r + \hat{y}_s)$, where r and s are the two members of R, or in other words, $R = \{r, s\}$ holds, plus the sum, over the members v of $(\mathcal{U}(V) \vdash \mathcal{U}(W))$, of a finite coefficent times

$$\left(\left(\hat{y}_v \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kQ}(y)\right)_{y = \mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))}\right),$$

where for each member v of $(\mathcal{U}(V) \vdash \mathcal{U}(W))$, the finite coefficient is equal to the sum of a finite number of terms, each of which has the form of a finite real number, independent of x and ρ, times a product of finite powers, all ≥ 0 and independent of x and ρ, of the ρ_K, $K \in (Q \vdash P)$.

This follows immediately from observation 38) above, together with the fact that, by the chain rule for differentiating a function of a function,

$$\hat{a}_C \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kQ}\left(\mu\left(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}\left(P, Q, H, \rho\right)\right)\right) = \hat{a}_C \left(\left(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kQ}\left(y\right)\right)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))}\right)$$

is equal to

$$\sum_{v \in \mathcal{U}(V)} \left(\left(\hat{a}_C \mu_v\left(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}\left(P, Q, H, \rho\right)\right)\right) . \left(\left(\hat{y}_v \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kQ}\left(y\right)\right)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))}\right)\right).$$

We now observe that, with the definitions of page 188, it follows directly from the equation displayed on page 189, together with observations 34), 37), and 39) above, that $\overset{\circ}{I}_k\left(B, i, n, j, s, E, v, \rho\right)$, where $\left(B, i, n, j, s, E, v\right)$ is any ordered septuple as on page 188, and k is any member of $\mathbb{N}$, is equal to the sum, over a finite number of ordered septuples $\left(\tilde{B}, \tilde{i}, \tilde{n}, \tilde{\tilde{j}}, \tilde{s}, \tilde{E}, \tilde{v}\right)$ as on page 171, each satisfying the condition on page 172, and each satisfying the condition that $\left(\#\left(\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{\tilde{j}}\right)\right) + \#\left(\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{E}\right)\right)\right)$ is not greater than the integer N defined on page 166, and each satisfying the requirement that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$, T is any $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V, and l is the member of T that is *not* the key member of any $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A that does not have f_A as a member, then there is *no* member β of $\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{\tilde{j}}\right)$ such that $\tilde{\tilde{j}}_\beta = l$ holds, and each satisfying the requirement that if v is any member of $\mathcal{U}\left(W\right)$, then the number of members β of $\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{\tilde{j}}\right)$ such that $\tilde{\tilde{j}}_\beta = v$ holds is $\leq$ the number of members β of $\mathcal{D}\left(j\right)$ such that $j_\beta = v$ holds, and each satisfying the requirement that if A is the particular member of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$ chosen arbitrarily on page 188, and T is the particular $(V \cup H)$-key of A that is not a member of V, chosen arbitrarily on page 188, and, as on page 188, m is the member of T that *is* the key member of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A that does not have f_A as a member, then the number of members β of $\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{\tilde{j}}\right)$ such that $\tilde{\tilde{j}}_\beta = m$ holds, is one *less* than the number of members β of $\mathcal{D}\left(j\right)$ such that $j_\beta = m$ holds, of $\overset{\circ}{I}_k\left(\tilde{B}, \tilde{i}, \tilde{n}, \tilde{\tilde{j}}, \tilde{s}, \tilde{E}, \tilde{v}, \rho\right)$ times a finite coefficient which is equal to the sum of a finite number of terms, each of which has the form of a finite real number, independent of k and ρ, times a product of finite powers, all ≥ 0 and independent of k and ρ, of the ρ_K, $K \in (Q \vdash P)$.

(We note that when we use observations 34), 37), and 39) above to write out the expanded form of the equation displayed on page 189, and take the dot product of $\hat{a}_C$

with the unit d-vector s_β, where β is the particular member of $\mathcal{D}(j)$, such that $j_\beta = m$ holds, that was arbitrarily selected on page 188, the term $\left(\left(s_\beta . \hat{y}_m \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kQ}(y)\right)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))}\right)$, which occurs in $s_\beta . \hat{a}_C \left(\left(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kQ}(y)\right)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))}\right)$ by observation 39) above, exactly reproduces the given integral $\overset{\circ}{I}_k(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho)$.)

And by using this result a sufficiently large, but finite, number of times, after first having used the result on page 187, we finally obtain the result stated on page 186, namely that if (B,i,n,j,s,E,v) is any ordered septuple as on page 171, such that the condition on page 172 holds, and such that $(\#(\mathcal{D}(j)) + \#(\mathcal{D}(E)))$ is not greater than the integer N defined on page 166, then there exists a finite collection of ordered septuples $\left(\tilde{B},\tilde{i},\tilde{n},\tilde{j},\tilde{s},\tilde{E},\tilde{v}\right)$ as on page 171, each satisfying the condition on page 172, and each satisfying the requirement that $\left(\#\left(\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{j}\right)\right) + \#\left(\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{E}\right)\right)\right)$ is not greater than the integer N defined on page 166, and each satisfying the further requirement that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and $T \equiv \{r,s\}$ is any $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V, then there is *no* member β of $\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{j}\right)$ such that $\tilde{j}_\beta = r$ holds and there is *no* member β of $\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{j}\right)$ such that $\tilde{j}_\beta = s$ holds, such that for each member k of $\mathbb{N}$, $\overset{\circ}{I}_k(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho)$ is equal to the sum, over this finite collection of septuples $\left(\tilde{B},\tilde{i},\tilde{n},\tilde{j},\tilde{s},\tilde{E},\tilde{v}\right)$, of $\overset{\circ}{I}_k\left(\tilde{B},\tilde{i},\tilde{n},\tilde{j},\tilde{s},\tilde{E},\tilde{v},\rho\right)$ times a finite real-number coefficient that is *independent of* k, and equal to the sum of a finite number of terms, each of which has the form of a finite real number, independent of k and ρ, times a product of finite powers, all ≥ 0 and independent of k and ρ, of the ρ_K, $K \in (Q \vdash P)$.

Finally we shall prove that if (B,i,n,j,s,E,v) is any ordered septuple as on page 171, such that the condition on page 172 holds, and such that $(\#(\mathcal{D}(j)) + \#(\mathcal{D}(E)))$ is not greater than the integer N defined on page 166, and such that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and T is any $(V \cup H)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V, then there is *no* member β of $\mathcal{D}(j)$ such that $j_\beta \in T$ holds, then the integrals with respect to ρ, over $\mathbb{D}$, of any k-independent product of finite powers, all ≥ 0 and independent of k and ρ, of the ρ_K, $K \in (Q \vdash P)$, times the $\overset{\circ}{I}_k(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, form a Cauchy sequence.

We shall do this in two steps. We first prove that if (B,i,n,j,s,E,v) is any ordered septuple satisfying the conditions just specified, and if we define $\overset{*}{I}(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho)$

by

$$\overset{*}{I}\left(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho\right)\equiv\int_{\mathbb{W}}\left(\prod_{A\in(V\vdash\{O\})}d^{d}x_{A}\right)\times$$

$$\times\left(\left(\prod_{C\in(Y\vdash G)}\mathcal{E}\left(\left(P\cap\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)\right),\left(Q\cap\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)\right),H,\sigma,R,\downarrow\left(x,\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)\right)\right)\right)\times\right.$$

$$\times\left(\left(\prod_{\alpha\in\mathcal{D}(B)}\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,B_{\alpha},i_{\alpha})}-x_{B_{\alpha}}\right).n_{\alpha}\right)\right)\left(\prod_{\beta\in\mathcal{D}(j)}\left(s_{\beta}.\hat{y}_{j_{\beta}}\right)\right)\times\right.$$

$$\left.\left.\times\left(\prod_{\gamma\in\mathcal{D}(E)}\left(v_{\gamma}.t_{E_{\gamma}}\right)\right)\mathcal{J}_{Q}\left(y\right)\right)_{y=\mu(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))}\right),$$

then $\overset{*}{I}\left(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho\right)$ is finite and *absolutely* convergent, and is moreover bounded above in magnitude, for all $\rho\in\mathbb{D}$, by a finite, ρ-independent constant.

Let (B,i,n,j,s,E,v) be any ordered septuple satisfying the conditions just specified, and let $\overset{*}{I}\left(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho\right)$ be defined, for any member ρ of $\mathbb{D}$, by the equation just given. Then in order to prove the finiteness, absolute convergence, and ρ-independent bound on the magnitude of $\overset{*}{I}\left(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho\right)$ it is sufficient, by Lemma 23, to prove the corresponding results for the integral over $\mathbb{W}$ of some function $F(x)$ such that for all $x\in\mathbb{W}$, $F(x)$ is greater than or equal to the magnitude of the integrand of $\overset{*}{I}\left(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho\right)$.

For any ordered triple (x,r,ρ) of a member x of $\mathbb{U}_{d}\left(V,\omega\right)$, a member r of $\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)$, and a member ρ of $\mathbb{D}$, we define $w\left(x,r,\rho\right)$ to be equal to

$$\left|\mu_{r}\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)-\mu_{s}\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)\right|$$

if r is a member of the member $\{r,s\}$ of the partition W, and to be equal to 1 if r is not a member of any member of W.

Then it immediately follows from the assumed properties of $\mathcal{J}$, that for all $x\in\mathbb{W}$, the integrand of the following integral $\bar{\bar{I}}(B,i,j,\rho)$ is greater than or equal to the magnitude of the integrand of $\overset{*}{I}\left(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho\right)$:

$$\bar{\bar{I}}(B,i,j,\rho)\equiv\int_{\mathbb{W}}\left(\prod_{A\in(V\vdash\{O\})}d^{d}x_{A}\right)\times$$

$$\times\Bigg(\Bigg(\prod_{C\in(Y\vdash G)}\mathcal{E}\left(\left(P\cap\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)\right),\left(Q\cap\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)\right),H,\sigma,R,\downarrow\left(x,\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)\right)\right)\Bigg)\times$$

$$\times M\left(\prod_{\alpha\in\mathcal{D}(B)}\left|x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,B_\alpha,i_\alpha)}-x_{B_\alpha}\right|\right)\left(\prod_{\beta\in\mathcal{D}(j)}\left(\frac{1}{w\left(x,j_\beta,\rho\right)}\right)\right)\times$$

$$\times\left(\prod_{\Delta\equiv\{r,s\}\in W}\left|\mu_r\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)-\mu_s\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)\right|^{-\theta_\Delta}\right)\times$$

$$\times\left(\prod_{\Delta\equiv\{r,s\}\in W}\mathbb{S}\left(T-\left|\mu_r\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)-\mu_s\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)\right|\right)\right)\Bigg)\Bigg)$$

Hence to prove the finiteness and absolute convergence of $\overset{*}{I}\left(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho\right)$, and a ρ-independent bound, for $\rho\in\mathbb{D}$, on the magnitude of $\overset{*}{I}\left(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho\right)$, it is sufficient to prove the convergence of $\bar{\bar{I}}(B,i,j,\rho)$, and a ρ-independent upper bound, for $\rho\in\mathbb{D}$, on $\bar{\bar{I}}(B,i,j,\rho)$.

We now change to the new integration variables a_C, $C\in\left(J\vdash\left(\mathcal{R}\left(S\right)\cup\left\{\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)\right\}\right)\right)$, as defined on pages 184 and 185, and we note that, as observed on page 185, the Jacobian determinant for the transformation to this new set of integration variables is equal to 1.

We recall that G is an H-principal wood of V, and that, as defined on page 168, Y is the set whose members are all the $(V\cup H)$-firm over V components of members of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$, together with the set $\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)$, and we note that, by Lemma 35 (iii), the set $G\cup Y$ is a wood of V.

We now make the following observations:

40) Let T be any member of W. Then if $\mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G\cup Y\right),T\right)\in G$ holds, $\mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G\cup Y\right),T\right)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$ and T is a $(V\cup H)$-key of $\mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G\cup Y\right),T\right)$ such that T is *not* a member of V, while if $\mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G\cup Y\right),T\right)\in\left(Y\vdash G\right)$ holds, then T is not a $(V\cup H)$-key of *any* member of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$. For $\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)$ is a member of Y hence a member of $(G\cup Y)$, hence $(G\cup Y)$ certainly has at least one member, namely $\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)$, that contains T as a subset, hence by definition $\mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G\cup Y\right),T\right)$ is the *smallest* member of $(G\cup Y)$ that contains T as a subset. Suppose first that $\mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G\cup Y\right),T\right)\in G$ holds. Now T is a member of W hence T intersects two members of V, hence T is *not* a subset of any member of V, (since V is a partition), hence $\mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G\cup Y\right),T\right)$ is not a member of V, hence $\mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G\cup Y\right),T\right)$

is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$. Hence every $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$ is a member of Y, hence T is *not* a subset of any $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$, hence, since by Lemma 31 the set whose members are all the $(V \cup H)$-firm over V components of $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$, is a partition of $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$, and furthermore T is a member of W, hence T has exactly two members, T intersects exactly two distinct $(V \cup H)$-firm over V components of $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$, say C and D. Let r be the member of T that is a member of C, let s be the member of T that is a member of D, and let X be the set whose members are all the $(V \cup H)$-keys of $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$ that are *not* members of V. Then by Lemma 29, $\uparrow(r, X)$, where $\uparrow(r, X)$ is defined as on pages 177 and 178 with reference to the member $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$ of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$, hence by Lemma 31 $\uparrow(r, X)$ is the unique $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$ that has r as a member, hence C is equal to $\uparrow(r, X)$. Let Z be the set whose members are all the members of X that intersect $C = \uparrow(r, X)$. Then by Lemma 28 (xi), $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$ is equal to the disjoint union of $C = \uparrow(r, X)$ and the sets $(\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T) \vdash \uparrow(r, \{R\}))$ for all the members R of Z, hence, since s is *not* a member of C, s is a member of the set $(\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T) \vdash \uparrow(r, \{R\}))$ for some member R of Z. Let R be the member of Z such that $s \in (\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T) \vdash \uparrow(r, \{R\}))$ holds. Then T is a member of $((V \cup H) \vdash V)$ such that T intersects both $C = \uparrow(r, X)$ and $(\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T) \vdash \uparrow(r, \{R\}))$, hence, since $C = \uparrow(r, X)$ is a subset of $\uparrow(r, \{R\})$, and by Lemma 28 (viii), R is the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both $\uparrow(r, \{R\})$ and $(\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T) \vdash \uparrow(r, \{R\}))$, R is equal to T, hence T is a $(V \cup H)$-key of $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$ such that T is *not* a member of V. Now suppose that $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$ is a member of $(Y \vdash G)$. Then $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$ is either equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$, or else $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$ is equal to a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of some member A of $\mathbb{B}(G)$. Suppose first that $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$ is equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$. Then $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is *not* a member of G, and T is not a subset of any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, hence since T has exactly two members, at most one of the two members of T can be a member of any particular member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, hence T is certainly not a $(V \cup H)$-key of any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$. Now suppose that $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$ is *not* equal to $\mathcal{U}(V)$. Then $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$ is a member of $(Y \vdash (V \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}))$, hence by Lemma 35 (i), $\mathcal{Y}(G, \mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T))$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, and $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$ is a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G, \mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T))$. Hence T is a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of $\mathcal{Y}(G, \mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T))$, hence since T is a member of $((V \cup H) \vdash V)$, Lemma 28 (xvi) and Lemma 29 imply that T is *not* a $(V \cup H)$-key of $\mathcal{Y}(G, \mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T))$. And if

A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ such that $\mathcal{Y}(G, \mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)) \subset A$ holds, then since G is an H-principal wood of V, $\mathcal{Y}(G, \mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T))$ is a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A, hence T is a subset of a $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of A, hence again Lemma 28 (xvi) and Lemma 29 imply that T is *not* a $(V \cup H)$-key of A. Hence since $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T) \in (Y \vdash G)$ implies that $\mathcal{Y}(G, \mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T))$ is equal to $\mathcal{Y}(G, T)$, T is not a $(V \cup H)$-key of any member A of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ such that $T \subseteq A$ holds. And finally, if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ such that $T \subseteq A$ does *not* hold, then at most one of the two members of T can be a member of A, hence T is certainly not a $(V \cup H)$-key of A.

41) Let $\{r, s\}$ be any member of W such that $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), \{r, s\})$ is a member of $(Y \vdash G)$, and let $C \equiv \mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), \{r, s\})$. Then the dependence of

$$(\mu_r(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho)) - \mu_s(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho)))$$

on the a_K variables is limited to dependence on the a_K such that K is a member of $P \cap (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, C)) \vdash \{C\})$. For if v is any member of $\mathcal{U}(W)$, then $\mu_v(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho))$ is a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of the x_K such that K is a member of Q such that $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, v) \subseteq K \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, v)$ holds. Let $D \equiv \mathcal{Y}(P, \{r, s\})$. Then since P is a member of $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$, either D is equal to the member $\mathcal{Y}(G, C) = \mathcal{Y}(G, \{r, s\})$ of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, or else D is a subset of C such that D is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(G, C)$. Suppose first that D is equal to the member $\mathcal{Y}(G, C) = \mathcal{Y}(G, \{r, s\})$ of $\mathbb{B}(G)$. Then since $\mathcal{Z}(Q, H, r) \subset D$ and $\mathcal{Z}(Q, H, s) \subset D$ both hold, and Q is a member of $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$, both $\mathcal{Z}(Q, H, r)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(Q, H, s)$ are subsets of C, hence both $\mathcal{Z}(Q, H, r)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(Q, H, s)$ are strict subsets of C, since $\mathcal{Z}(Q, H, r) \cap \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, s) = \emptyset$ holds and neither $\mathcal{Z}(Q, H, r)$ nor $\mathcal{Z}(Q, H, s)$ is empty. And furthermore, both $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, r)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, s)$ are members of $\mathcal{P}(P, D)$ that are strict subsets of C. (In fact $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, r)$ is equal to $\mathcal{K}(P, D, r)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, s)$ is equal to $\mathcal{K}(P, D, s)$.) Hence by Lemma 4, if K is any member of Q such that $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, r) \subseteq K \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, r)$ holds or $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, s) \subseteq K \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, s)$ holds, then x_K is equal to a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of the x_L such that L is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, D)$ such that $L \subseteq C$ holds, hence by page 173, if K is any such member of Q, then x_K is equal to x_{S_D} plus a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of the z_L such that L is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, D)$ such that $L \subseteq C$ holds. Now D is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ in the present case, hence by page 184, if L is any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, D)$, then z_L is equal to a_L plus z_{S_E}, where E is the *smallest* member of J to contain L as a *strict* subset, where J is the wood defined on page 173. Now since $C \subset D$ holds in the present case, C is *not* a member of P in the present case, hence every member L of $\mathcal{P}(P, D)$ such that $L \subseteq C$ holds, is a *strict* subset of C, hence if L is any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, D)$ such that $L \subseteq C$ holds, then the smallest member E of J to contain L as a strict subset, is equal to the smallest member of J that contains C as a subset, and is the *same* for *every* member L of $\mathcal{P}(P, D)$ such that $L \subseteq C$ holds. Let E be the smallest member of J to contain C as a subset. Then by the foregoing, if K is any member of Q such that $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, r) \subseteq K \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, r)$ holds or $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, s) \subseteq K \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, s)$ holds, then x_K is equal to $(x_{S_D} + z_{S_E})$ plus a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of the a_L such that L is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, D)$ such that $L \subset C$ holds. Hence $\mu_r(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho))$ is equal to $(x_{S_D} + z_{S_E})$ plus a linear combination, with coefficents summing to 1, of the a_L such that L is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, D)$ such that $L \subset C$ holds, and $\mu_s(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho))$ is also equal to $(x_{S_D} + z_{S_E})$ plus a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of the a_L such that L is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, D)$ such that $L \subset C$ holds, hence

$$(\mu_r(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho)) - \mu_s(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho)))$$

is equal to a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 0, of the a_L such that L is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, D)$ such that $L \subset C$ holds, and every such member L of $\mathcal{P}(P, D)$ is a member of $P \cap (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, C)) \vdash \{C\})$ (We note in passing that since every member L of $\mathcal{P}(P, D)$ that can contribute to $\mu_r(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho))$, is a subset of $\mathcal{Z}(Q, H, r)$, and every member L of $\mathcal{P}(P, D)$ that can contribute to $\mu_s(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho))$ is a subset of $\mathcal{Z}(Q, H, s)$, and $\mathcal{Z}(Q, H, r) \cap \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, s)$ is equal to the empty set $\emptyset$, the coefficients in $(\mu_r(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho)) - \mu_s(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho)))$ do *not* vanish identically.) Now suppose that $D \equiv \mathcal{Y}(P, \{r, s\})$ is a subset of C such that D is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(G, C)$. Then no member of $\mathcal{P}(P, D)$ is a strict subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(G, C)$, and $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, r)$ is equal to $\mathcal{K}(P, D, r)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, s)$ is equal to $\mathcal{K}(P, D, s)$, and $\mathcal{Z}(Q, H, r)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(Q, H, s)$ are strict subsets of D such that $\mathcal{Z}(Q, H, r) \cap \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, s) = \emptyset$ holds, hence if K is any member of Q such that $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, r) \subseteq K \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, r)$ holds or $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, s) \subseteq K \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, s)$ holds, then x_K is equal to a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of the x_L, $L \in \mathcal{P}(P, D)$, hence by page 173, if K is any such member of Q, then x_K is equal to x_{S_D} plus a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of the z_L,

$L \in \mathcal{P}(P, D)$. And furthermore no member L of $\mathcal{P}(P, D)$ is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ for any member A of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, hence by page 184, if L is any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, D)$, then $z_L = a_L$ holds, hence if K is any member of Q such that $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, r) \subseteq K \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, r)$ holds or $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, s) \subseteq K \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, s)$ holds, then x_K is equal to x_{S_D} plus a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of the a_L, $L \in \mathcal{P}(P, D)$, hence

$$(\mu_r(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho)) - \mu_s(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho)))$$

is equal to a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 0, of the a_L, $L \in \mathcal{P}(P, D)$, and every member L of $\mathcal{P}(P, D)$ is a member of $(\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, C)) \vdash \{C\})$. (And, as in the previous case, the fact that $\mathcal{Z}(Q, H, r) \cap \mathcal{Z}(Q, H, s) = \emptyset$ holds implies that the coefficients do *not* vanish identically.)

42) Let $T \equiv \{l, m\}$ be any member of W such that $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T) \in G$ holds, (so that, by observation 40) above, $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ and T is a $(V \cup H)$-key of $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$ such that T is *not* a member of V), let $C \equiv \mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), T)$, let $D \equiv (C \vdash\uparrow (f_C, \{T\}))$, where for any member r of C and any subset X of the set of all the $(V \cup H)$-keys of C that are *not* members of V, $\uparrow(r, X)$ is defined as on pages 177 and 178 with reference to the member C of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, (so that, by the definition on page 173 of the wood J, D is a member of J), and let m be the member of T that is the key member of the $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component $(C \vdash\uparrow (f_C, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R \in Z} (C \vdash\uparrow (f_C, \{R\}))\right)$ of C, where Z is the set whose members are all the $(V \cup H)$-keys R of C such that $R \notin V$ and $R \to T$ both hold, where the relation $\to$ among the $(V \cup H)$-keys of C is defined with reference to the member f_C of C, as on page 177. Then

$$(\mu_m(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho)) - \mu_l(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho)))$$

is equal to a_D minus a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of the a_L such that L is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, C)$ such that L is a subset of the unique $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component N of C that has l as a member. (We note that $N \cap D = \emptyset$ holds, so that $L \cap D = \emptyset$ holds for every such member L of $\mathcal{P}(P, C)$.)

For let N be the unique $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of C that has l as a member. Then since P is a member of $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$, and $\{l, m\}$ is a subset of C but is *not* a subset of N, $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, l)$ is equal to $\mathcal{K}(P, C, l)$, hence $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, l)$ is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, C)$ that is a subset of N, and furthermore since Q is a member of $\mathbb{O}(G, H)$, $\mathcal{Z}(Q, H, l)$ is also a subset of N, hence if K is any member of Q such that $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, l) \subseteq$

$K \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q,H,l)$ holds, then by Lemma 4, x_K is equal to a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of the x_L such that L is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P,C)$ such that $L \subseteq N$ holds, hence by page 173, x_K is equal to x_{S_C} plus a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of the z_L such that L is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P,C)$ such that $L \subseteq N$ holds.

We next note that N is *not* equal to $(C \vdash\uparrow (f_C, \{R\}))$ for *any* $(V \cup H)$-key R of C such that R is not a member of V, from which it follows immediately, from the definition of the wood J on page 173, that if N is a member of J then N is a member of P. For if R was a $(V \cup H)$-key of C such that $R \notin V$ held and N was equal to $(C \vdash\uparrow (f_C, \{R\}))$, then by Lemma 28 (viii), R would be the *only* member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both $(C \vdash N)$and N. But l is a member of N and m is *not* a member of N, hence T intersects both $(C \vdash N)$ and N, and R is certainly not equal to T, for $D \equiv (C \vdash\uparrow (f_C, \{T\}))$ is *disjoint* from N, and moreover m is a member of D and l is *not* a member of D. (We refer to the definition, on pages 179 and 180, of the key member of any $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of C that does not have f_C as a member, and we note in passing that if R is any $(V \cup H)$-key of C such that $R \notin V$ holds,then the set $(C \vdash\uparrow (f_C, \{R\}))$ is $(V \cup H)$-firm over V ifif there are *no* $(V \cup H)$-keys $\tilde{R}$ of C such that $\tilde{R} \notin V$ and $\tilde{R} \to R$ both hold.)

Now let U be the *smallest* member of J to contain N as a *strict* subset. Then it immediately follows from the foregoing that if L is any member of $\mathcal{P}(P,C)$ such that $L \subseteq N$ holds, then U is the smallest member of J to contain L as a strict subset. For if N is a member of J, then as just shown, N is a member of P, hence there is exactly one member L of $\mathcal{P}(P,C)$ such that $L \subseteq N$ holds, namely the set $L = N$, and U is by definition the smallest member of J to contain N as a strict subset. And if N is *not* a member of J, then N is not a member of P, (since P is a subset of J), hence if L is any member of $\mathcal{P}(P,C)$ such that $L \subseteq N$ holds, then $L \subset N$ holds, and moreover L is not a strict subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(G,C)$, (since G is a subset of P), hence, since it follows directly from the definition of J that every member of $(J \vdash P)$ that is a strict subset of N, is a subset of some member of $\mathcal{P}(G,C)$ that is a subset of N, U is again the smallest member of J to contain L as a strict subset.

Hence by page 184, if L is any member of $\mathcal{P}(P,C)$ such that $L \subseteq N$ holds, then z_L is equal to $(z_{S_U} + a_L)$, hence by the foregoing, if K is any member of Q such that $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,l) \subseteq K \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q,H,l)$ holds, then x_K is equal to $(x_{S_C} + z_{S_U})$ plus a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of the a_L such that L is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P,C)$ such that $L \subseteq N$ holds, hence $\mu_l(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))$ is equal to $(x_{S_C} + z_{S_U})$ plus a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of the a_L such that L is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P,C)$ such that $L \subseteq N$ holds.

We next note that $D \subset U$ holds, and that U is the *smallest* member of J to contain D as a *strict* subset. For U is either equal to C, or else is equal to $(C \vdash\uparrow (f_C, \{R\}))$ for some $(V \cup H)$-key R of C such that R is *not* a member of V. And furthermore, by pages 173 to 177, if U is equal to C, then N is equal to the unique $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of C that has f_C as a member, hence T intersects the unique $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of C that has f_C as a member, hence there is *no* $(V \cup H)$-key R of C such that $R \notin V$ and $T \to R$ both hold, hence there is *no* member K of $(J \vdash P)$ such that $D \subset K$ and $K \subset D$ both hold, and furthermore $D \subset C$ certainly holds hence $D \subset U$ holds, while if U is equal to $(C \vdash\uparrow (f_C, \{R\}))$ for some $(V \cup H)$-key R of C such that R is *not* a member of V, then f_C is *not* a member of N, (for the unique $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of C that has f_C as a member is not a strict subset of *any* member of J that is a strict subset of C), and R, (which by Lemma 28 (viii) is identified uniquely as the only member of $(V \cup H)$ to intersect both $(C \vdash U)$ and U), is equal, by page 179, to the unique $(V \cup H)$-key of C that is *not* a member of V and which has as a member the key member of N, hence again by page 179, $T \to R$ holds, hence by pages 173 to 177, $D \subset U$ holds, and furthermore, since T intersects N, there is *no* $(V \cup H)$-key $\tilde{R}$ of C such that $\tilde{R} \notin V$ and $T \to \tilde{R}$ and $\tilde{R} \to R$ all hold, hence there is *no* member K of J such that $D \subset K \subset U$ holds.

Now let Z be the set whose members are all the $(V \cup H)$-keys R of C such that $R \notin V$ and $R \to T$ both hold, and let $M \equiv (C \vdash\uparrow (f_C, \{T\})) \vdash \left(\bigcup_{R \in Z} (C \vdash\uparrow (f_C, \{R\}))\right)$ be the unique $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of C that has m as its key member. Then since P is a member of $\mathbb{O}(G,H)$, and $\{l,m\}$ is a subset of C but is *not* a subset of M, $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,m)$ is equal to $\mathcal{K}(P,C,m)$, hence $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,m)$ is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P,C)$ that is a subset of M, and furthermore since Q is a member of $\mathbb{O}(G,H)$, $\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,m)$ is also a subset of M, hence if K is any member of Q such that $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,m) \subseteq K \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q,H,m)$ holds, then by Lemma 4, x_K is equal to a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of the x_L such that L is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P,C)$ such that $L \subseteq M$ holds, hence by page 173, x_K is equal to x_{S_C} plus a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of the z_L such that L is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P,C)$ such that $L \subseteq M$ holds.

Now, in accordance with the notation of pages 181 to 183, but with the set A of those pages taken as the present C, and the set B of those pages taken as the present

M, so that the i of those pages is the present m, let F_M be the set whose members are all the members L of $\mathcal{P}(P,C)$ such that $L \subseteq M$ holds, so that F_M is equal to $\{M\}$ if M *is* a member of P, and F_M is equal to $\mathcal{P}(P,M)$ if M is *not* a member of P.

Then by page 184,

$$\mu_m(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho)) = \sum_{L\in F_M} \nu_{DL} x_L = x_{S_C} + \sum_{L\in F_M} \nu_{DL} z_L = x_{S_C} + z_D$$

holds if $D = (C \vdash\uparrow (f_C, \{T\}))$ is a member of $(J \vdash P)$, (we note that our present D corresponds to the K of pages 183 and 184, and that the sets D of pages 183 and 184 correspond to our present sets L), while if D is a member of P, then the set Z defined above is empty, D is equal to M, and moreover both $\mathcal{Z}(P,H,m)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,m)$ are also equal to M hence equal to D, hence $\mu_m(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))$ is equal to x_D, hence again

$$\mu_m(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho)) = x_{S_C} + z_D$$

holds. Hence by the foregoing and page 184,

$$\mu_m(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho)) = x_{S_C} + z_{S_U} + a_D$$

holds, hence, as stated,

$$(\mu_m(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho)) - \mu_l(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho)))$$

is equal to a_D minus a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of the a_L such that L is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P,C)$ such that L is a subset of the unique $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component N of C that has l as a member.

43) Let C be any member of $(Y \vdash G)$. Then the dependence of

$$\mathcal{E}((P \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C))), (Q \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C))), H, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C))))$$

on the a_D variables is limited to dependence on the a_D such that D is a member of $P \cap (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C)) \vdash \{C\})$. (We note that this observation is related to observation 34) above on page 189.) For the expression $\mathcal{E}((P \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C))), (Q \cap \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C))), H, \sigma, R, \downarrow(x, \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C))))$ depends on x only through differences $(x_K - x_L)$, where both K and L are members of $\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C))$, and by observations 30) to 33) above, if D is any member of $(J \vdash (\mathcal{R}(S) \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}))$ such that D is *not* a member of $P \cap (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C)) \vdash \{C\})$, then either x_K is independent of a_D for every member K of $\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)$, or else a_D occurs in x_K with the *same* coefficient for every member K of $\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)$, so that a_D cancels out of every difference $(x_K - x_L)$, where both K and L are members of $\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)$.

44) Let D be any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right)$ such that D is *not* a member of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$, let $C \equiv \mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G\cup Y\right),D\right)$, and let l be any member of D. Then $C = \mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G\cup Y\right),D\right)$ is a member of $(Y \vdash G)$, and the dependence of $\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,D,l)} - x_D\right)$ on the a_K variables is limited to dependence on the a_K such that K is a member of $P \cap \left(\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right) \vdash \{C\}\right)$. (We note that this observation is related to observation 35) above on page 189.) For D is a member of $(Q \vdash G)$ and Q is a member of $\mathbb{O}\left(G,H\right)$, so if A is any member of G such that $D \subseteq A$ holds, then A is a member of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$, (since D is not a member of G hence is not a member of V), hence $D \subset A$ holds, hence D is a subset of a $(V\cup H)$-firm over V component of A, and by the definition of Y on page 168, that $(V\cup H)$-firm over V component of A is a member of Y. Hence if there *exists* any member A of G such that $D \subseteq A$ holds, then $C = \mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G\cup Y\right),D\right)$ is a $(V\cup H)$-firm over V component of the member $\mathcal{Y}\left(G,D\right)$ of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$, hence C is a member of Y, and moreover C is not a member of V since D is not a member of V, hence C is not a member of G, (since *no* $(V\cup H)$-firm over V component of any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$ is a member of G, unless it is a member of V), hence C is a member of $(Y \vdash G)$. And if there is *no* member A of G such that $D \subseteq A$ holds, then $\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)$ is *not* a member of G, and $C = \mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G\cup Y\right),D\right)$ is equal to the member $\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)$ of $(Y \vdash G)$. Now both $\mathcal{K}\left(Q,D,l\right)$ and D are members of $\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)$, for both $\mathcal{K}\left(Q,D,l\right)$ and D are subsets of C, and both $\mathcal{K}\left(Q,D,l\right)$ and D are members of Q hence overlap no member of G, hence in particular overlap no member of $\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)$, and by the definition of $C \equiv \mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G\cup Y\right),D\right)$, D is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)$, hence if F is the set whose members are all the members L of $\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)$ such that $L \subseteq D$ holds, then F is a partition of D and every member of F is a *strict* subset of D, (and in fact F is equal to $\mathcal{P}\left(G,D\right)$), hence D is certainly a member of $\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)$, and furthermore $\mathcal{K}\left(G,D,l\right) \subseteq \mathcal{K}\left(Q,D,l\right)$ holds, hence $\mathcal{K}\left(Q,D,l\right)$ is *not* a strict subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)$, hence $\mathcal{K}\left(Q,D,l\right)$ is also a member of $\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)$. Hence exactly as in observation 43) above, $\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,D,l)} - x_D\right)$ does *not* depend on any a_K such that K is *not* a member of $P \cap \left(\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right) \vdash \{C\}\right)$.

45) Let D be any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$ and l be any member of D. Then whenever the product of factors

$$\left(\prod_{C\in(Y\vdash G)}\mathcal{E}\left(\left(P\cap\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)\right),\left(Q\cap\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)\right),H,\sigma,R,\downarrow\left(x,\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)\right)\right)\right)\times$$

$$\times\left(\prod_{\Delta\equiv\{r,s\}\in W}\mathbb{S}\left(T-\left|\mu_r\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)-\mu_s\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)\right|\right)\right)$$

is not equal to 0, $\left|x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,D,l)}-x_D\right|\leq\frac{(\#(V)-1)T}{(1-2\lambda)}$ holds.

For we note first that both $\mathcal{K}\left(Q,D,l\right)$ and D are members of $\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,D\right)\right)$, hence since $\mathbb{W}$ is a subset of $\mathbb{U}_d\left(V,\omega\right)$ which, by page 33, is a subset of $\mathbb{F}_d\left(V\right)$, both $x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,D,l)}$ and x_D are members of $\mathbb{V}\left(\downarrow\left(x,\mathcal{P}\left(P,D\right)\right)\right)$, or in other words, both $x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,D,l)}$ and x_D are members of the convex hull of the x_L, $L\in\mathcal{P}\left(P,D\right)$. Hence by Lemma 3, $\left|x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,D,l)}-x_D\right|\leq\max\limits_{\substack{K\in\mathcal{P}(P,D)\\L\in\mathcal{P}(P,D)}}\left|x_K-x_L\right|=\mathbb{L}\left(P,D,x\right)$ holds.

We next note that since P is a member of $\mathbb{O}\left(G,H\right)$, every member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P,D\right)$ is a subset of some $(V\cup H)$-firm over V component of D.

Let C be any $(V\cup H)$-firm over V component of D, (which implies, by the definition of the set Y on page 168, that C is a member of Y), and suppose that C is *not* a member of P. Then C is *not* a member of G, hence C is a member of $(Y\vdash G)$, hence whenever the above product of factors is not equal to 0, and by Lemmas 14 and 15 and page 91, and by analogy with pages 107 and 126, $\mathbb{L}\left(P,C,x\right)\leq\frac{(\#(\mathcal{P}(P,C))-1)T}{(1-2\lambda)}$ holds.

We now define, for each $(V\cup H)$-firm over V component C of D, F_C to be the set whose members are all the members L of $\mathcal{P}\left(P,D\right)$ such that $L\subseteq C$ holds, so that F_C is equal to $\mathcal{P}\left(P,C\right)$ if C is *not* a member of P, and F_C is equal to $\{C\}$ if C *is* a member of P. Then it immediately follows from the previous paragraph, together with the fact that if C is any $(V\cup H)$-firm over V component of D such that C *is* a member of P, and K and L are any members of F_C, then $K=L=C$ holds so that $\left|x_K-x_L\right|=0$ holds, that if C is *any* $(V\cup H)$-firm over V component of D, and K and L are any members of F_C, then $\left|x_K-x_L\right|\leq\frac{(\#(F_C)-1)T}{(1-2\lambda)}$ holds.

Now the set $(G\cup Y)$ is a wood of V by Lemma 35 (iii), and the members of $\mathcal{P}\left(\left(G\cup Y\right),D\right)$ are the $(V\cup H)$-firm over V components of D, hence by use of Lemma 15 with the set V of Lemma 15 taken as the set $\mathcal{P}\left(\left(G\cup Y\right),D\right)$, (and noting that the fact that D is $(V\cup H)$-connected implies that D is $(\mathcal{P}\left(\left(G\cup Y\right),D\right)\cup H)$-connected), and noting, moreover, that if $\{r,s\}$ is any $(V\cup H)$-key of D such that $\{r,s\}$ is *not* a member of V, then $\mu_r\left(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}\left(P, Q, H, \rho\right)\right)$ is a member of the convex hull of the x_L such that L is a member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, D\right)$ such that L is a subset of the unique $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of D that has r as a member, and $\mu_s\left(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}\left(P, Q, H, \rho\right)\right)$ is a member of the convex hull of the x_L such that L is a member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, D\right)$ such that L is a subset of the unique $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of D that has s as a member, we find that if K and L are *any* members of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, D\right)$, then $|x_K - x_L|$ is less than or equal to $\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(\left(G \cup Y\right), D\right)\right) - 1\right) T$ plus the sum, over the members n of the domain of the map M constructed as in Lemma 15, (so that $\#\left(\mathcal{D}\left(M\right)\right) \leq \#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(\left(G \cup Y\right), D\right)\right)$ holds and $\mathcal{R}\left(M\right)$ is a subset of $\mathcal{P}\left(\left(G \cup Y\right), D\right)$), of $\frac{\left(\#\left(F_{M_n}\right) - 1\right)T}{(1-2\lambda)}$, hence, since it follows directly from the construction of Lemma 15 that we may assume that no member C of $\mathcal{P}\left(\left(G \cup Y\right), D\right)$, (or in other words, no $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component C of D), is equal to M_n for *more* than one member n of $\mathcal{D}\left(M\right)$, $|x_K - x_L|$ is less than or equal to $(-T)$ plus the sum, over the members C of $\mathcal{P}\left(\left(G \cup Y\right), D\right)$, of $\frac{\#\left(F_C\right)T}{(1-2\lambda)}$, hence $|x_K - x_L|$ is less than or equal to $(-T)$ plus $\frac{\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,D\right)\right)T}{(1-2\lambda)}$, hence $|x_K - x_L|$ is less than or equal to $\frac{\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,D\right)\right)-1\right)T}{(1-2\lambda)}$, hence $|x_K - x_L|$ is less than or equal to $\frac{\left(\#\left(V\right)-1\right)T}{(1-2\lambda)}$.

Now let (B, i, n, j, s, E, v) be any ordered septuple (B, i, n, j, s, E, v) as on pages 197 and 198, and satisfying the conditions specified on page 197. We define $\tilde{B}$ to be the map obtained from B by *deleting* from B all members (α, B_α) of B such that B_α is a member of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$, and *retaining,* as members of $\tilde{B}$, all members (α, B_α) of B such that B_α is a member of $(Q \vdash G)$. It then follows immediately from Lemma 23 and observation 45) above that for all $\rho \in \mathbb{D}$, $\bar{\bar{I}}(B, i, j, \rho)$ is less than or equal to $\left(\frac{\left(\#\left(V\right)-1\right)T}{(1-2\lambda)}\right)^{\left(\#\left(\mathcal{D}\left(B\right)\right) - \#\left(\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{B}\right)\right)\right)}$ times $\bar{\bar{I}}\left(\tilde{B}, i, j, \rho\right)$, hence to prove the finiteness of $\bar{\bar{I}}(B, i, j, \rho)$ and a ρ-independent bound on $\bar{\bar{I}}(B, i, j, \rho)$, it is sufficient to prove the finiteness of $\bar{\bar{I}}\left(\tilde{B}, i, j, \rho\right)$ and a ρ-independent bound on $\bar{\bar{I}}\left(\tilde{B}, i, j, \rho\right)$.

We note furthermore that the condition on page 172 is in fact a condition on the two members B and j of the septuple (B, i, n, j, s, E, v), and that it immediately follows from the fact that B and j satisfy the condition on page 172, that $\tilde{B}$ and j satisfy the condition on page 172 for all members A of $\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right)$ *except* for the members A of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$, or in other words, that $\tilde{B}$ and j satisfy the condition on page 172 when that condition is modified to apply just to the members A of $(Q \vdash G)$ rather than to all the members A of $\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right)$. For if A is any member of $(Q \vdash G) = \left(\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right) \vdash \mathbb{B}\left(G\right)\right)$, then it follows directly from the fact that $G \subseteq P \subseteq Q$ holds, that if C is any member of G, then either $A \subset C$ holds or $A \cap C = \emptyset$ holds or C is a subset of some member of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$, (for if $C \subset A$

holds and D is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ such that $D \cap C$ is nonempty, then $D \subset C$ cannot hold hence $C \subseteq D$ holds), hence C is *not* a member of $(\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(P, A))$, hence the number of members α of $\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{B}\right)$ such that $\tilde{B}_\alpha \in (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(P, A))$ holds, is equal to the number of members α of $\mathcal{D}(B)$ such that $B_\alpha \in (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(P, A))$ holds.

We now express $\bar{\bar{I}}\left(\tilde{B}, i, j, \rho\right)$ in terms of the a_K variables, $K \in (J \vdash (\mathcal{R}(S) \cup \{\mathcal{U}(V)\}))$, and we note that if $U \equiv \{l, m\}$ is any member of W such that $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), U) \in G$ holds, so that by observation 40) above, $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), U)$ is a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ and U is a $(V \cup H)$-key of $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), U)$ such that U is *not* a member of V, then it follows directly from observations 41) to 44) above that if we define $C \equiv \mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), U)$ and $D \equiv (C \vdash\uparrow (f_C, \{U\}))$, (so that, by page 173, D is a member of J and, by pages 173, 178, and 179, D is *not* a member of $\mathcal{R}(S)$), then the *only* dependence of $\bar{\bar{I}}\left(\tilde{B}, i, j, \rho\right)$ on a_D is through the two factors

$$|\mu_m(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho)) - \mu_l(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho))|^{-\theta_U} \times$$

$$\times \mathbb{S}\left(T - |\mu_m(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho)) - \mu_l(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho))|\right),$$

and furthermore, if m is the member of U that is a member of D, then by observation 42) above, if we define N to be the unique $(V \cup H)$-firm over V component of C that has l as a member, and if we moreover define F_N to be the set whose members are all the members L of $\mathcal{P}(P, C)$ such that $L \subseteq N$ holds, and if we moreover define e_L, $L \in F_N$, to be the coefficients, summing to 1, of the a_L, $L \in F_N$, referred to in observation 42) above, then the above two factors are equal to

$$\left|a_D - \left(\sum_{L \in F_N} e_L a_L\right)\right|^{-\theta_U} \mathbb{S}\left(T - \left|a_D - \left(\sum_{L \in F_N} e_L a_L\right)\right|\right)$$

hence, since by assumption $\theta_R < d$ holds for every member R of W, hence in particular, $\theta_U < d$ holds, the integral over a_D is an integral with d-dimensional spherical symmetry, and has the finite, ρ-independent value:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{cc} \dfrac{2(2\pi)^{\left(\frac{d-1}{2}\right)}}{(d-2)!!} \dfrac{T^{(d-\theta_U)}}{(d-\theta_U)} & (d \text{ odd and } \geq 1) \\ \dfrac{2\pi^{\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)}}{\left(\frac{d-2}{2}\right)!} \dfrac{T^{(d-\theta_U)}}{(d-\theta_U)} & (d \text{ even and } \geq 2) \end{array}\right\},$$

where $(-1)!! \equiv 1$, and for d odd, $d \geq 3$, $(d-2)!! \equiv (d-2)(d-4)!!$.

We use this result for *every* member U of W such that $\mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G \cup Y\right), U\right) \in G$ holds, or in other words, by observation 40) above, for *every* member U of W such that U is a $(V \cup H)$-key, such that U is *not* a member of V, of some member of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$, or in other words, since *no* member of W is a member of V, (since every member of W intersects exactly *two* members of V, and V is a partition), for *every* member U of W such that U is a $(V \cup H)$-key of some member of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$, after which we find, by observations 41) to 44) above, that $\bar{\bar{I}}\left(\tilde{B}, i, j, \rho\right)$ completely factorizes into a product of finite, ρ-independent real numbers, times the product, over the members C of $(Y \vdash G)$, of an integral $\overset{\circ}{\bar{\bar{I}}}_C\left(\tilde{\tilde{B}}_C, \tilde{i}_C, \tilde{j}_C, \rho\right)$, where $\tilde{\tilde{B}}_C$ is defined to be the map that is the subset of the map $\tilde{B}$ which includes precisely all the members $\left(\alpha, \tilde{B}_\alpha\right)$ of $\tilde{B}$ such that $\tilde{B}_\alpha \in \left(\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)\right) \vdash \mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)\right)$ holds, (or in other words, by observation 44) above and the fact that $\mathcal{R}\left(\tilde{B}\right)$ is a subset of $(Q \vdash G) = \left(\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right) \vdash \mathbb{B}\left(G\right)\right)$, such that $\mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G \cup Y\right), \tilde{B}_\alpha\right) = C$ holds), $\tilde{i}_C$ is defined to be the map that is the subset of the map i which includes precisely all the members (α, i_α) of i such that $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{\tilde{B}}_C\right)$ holds, and $\tilde{j}_C$ is defined to be the map that is the subset of the map j which includes precisely all the members (β, j_β) of j such that j_β is a member of $\mathcal{U}\left(W\right)$, and the unique member $\mathcal{C}\left(W, j_\beta\right)$ of W that has j_β as a member, satisfies the requirement that $\mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G \cup Y\right), \mathcal{C}\left(W, j_\beta\right)\right) = C$ holds, and for any member C of $(Y \vdash G)$, and for any ordered quadruple $\left(\overset{*}{B}, \overset{*}{i}, \overset{*}{j}, \rho\right)$ of a map $\overset{*}{B}$ such that $\mathcal{D}\left(\overset{*}{B}\right)$ is finite and $\mathcal{R}\left(\overset{*}{B}\right) \subseteq \left(Q \cap \left(\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)\right) \vdash \mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)\right)\right)$ holds, a map $\overset{*}{i}$ such that $\mathcal{D}\left(\overset{*}{B}\right) \subseteq \mathcal{D}\left(\overset{*}{i}\right)$ holds and for each member α of $\mathcal{D}\left(\overset{*}{B}\right)$, $\overset{*}{i}_\alpha$ is a member of $\overset{*}{B}_\alpha$, a map $\overset{*}{j}$ such that $\mathcal{D}\left(\overset{*}{j}\right)$ is finite and for each member β of $\mathcal{D}\left(\overset{*}{j}\right)$, $\overset{*}{j}_\beta$ is either a member of $\mathcal{U}\left(W\right)$ such that $\mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G \cup Y\right), \mathcal{C}\left(W, \overset{*}{j}_\beta\right)\right) = C$ holds, or else is a member of $\left(C \vdash \mathcal{U}\left(W\right)\right)$, and a member ρ of $\mathbb{D}$, the integral $\overset{\circ}{\bar{\bar{I}}}_C\left(\overset{*}{B}, \overset{*}{i}, \overset{*}{j}, \rho\right)$ is defined by

$$\overset{\circ}{\bar{\bar{I}}}_C\left(\overset{*}{B}, \overset{*}{i}, \overset{*}{j}, \rho\right) \equiv \int_{\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_C}\left(\prod_{A \in N_C} d^d a_A\right) \times$$

$$\times \Bigg(\mathcal{E}\left(\left(P \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)\right)\right), \left(Q \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)\right)\right), H, \sigma, R, \downarrow\left(x, \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)\right)\right)\right) \times$$

$$\times \left(\prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{D}\left(\overset{*}{B}\right)}\left|x_{\mathcal{K}\left(Q, \overset{*}{B}_\alpha, \overset{*}{i}_\alpha\right)} - x_{\overset{*}{B}_\alpha}\right|\right)\left(\prod_{\beta \in \mathcal{D}\left(\overset{*}{j}\right)}\left(\frac{1}{w\left(x, \overset{*}{j}_\beta, \rho\right)}\right)\right)\Bigg) \times$$

$$\times\left(\prod_{\Delta\equiv\{r,s\}\in\tilde{W}_C}\left|\mu_r\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)-\mu_s\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)\right|^{-\theta_\Delta}\right)\times$$

$$\times\left(\prod_{\Delta\equiv\{r,s\}\in\tilde{W}_C}\mathbb{S}\left(T-\left|\mu_r\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)-\mu_s\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)\right|\right)\right)\Bigg)\Bigg),$$

where N_C is the set $\left(\left(P\cap\left(\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)\vdash\{C\}\right)\right)\vdash\left(\mathcal{R}\left(S\right)\cup\{\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)\}\right)\right)$, $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_C$ is the set $\mathbb{E}_d^{(N_C)}$, and $\tilde{W}_C$ is the set whose members are all the members $\{r,s\}$ of W such that $\mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G\cup Y\right),\{r,s\}\right)=C$ holds.

We note that in consequence of the manner in which the set S was extended to the domain $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{J}\right)$ on page 178, N_C includes, for each member D of $\mathbb{B}\left(P\cap\left(\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)\right)\right)=\left(\left(P\cap\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)\right)\vdash\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)$, exactly $\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,D\right)\right)-1\right)$ of the $\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P,D\right)\right)$ members of $\mathcal{P}\left(P,D\right)$, hence the a_K variables, $K\in N_C$, are in the same relation to the wood $P\cap\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)$, as the z_K variables, defined on pages 127 and 129 for Theorem 1, are to the wood P of Theorem 1, and furthermore, by page 24 and by analogy with pages 127 and 129, $\#\left(N_C\right)$ is equal to $\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G,C\right)\right)-1\right)$.

And we note that every variable x in the above formula for $\overset{\circ}{\bar{I}}_C\left(\overset{*}{B},\overset{*}{i},\overset{*}{j},\rho\right)$ is to be expressed in terms of the a_K variables by the formulae on pages 184 and 185, and that by observations 41), 43), and 44) above, and in consequence of the particular combinations in which the x variables occur in the formula for $\overset{\circ}{\bar{I}}_C\left(\overset{*}{B},\overset{*}{i},\overset{*}{j},\rho\right)$, when we *do* express the x variables in the integrand of $\overset{\circ}{\bar{I}}_C\left(\overset{*}{B},\overset{*}{i},\overset{*}{j},\rho\right)$ in terms of the a_K variables, the dependence of the integrand of $\overset{\circ}{\bar{I}}_C\left(\overset{*}{B},\overset{*}{i},\overset{*}{j},\rho\right)$ on the a_K variables is limited to dependence on the a_K such that K is a member of N_C.

We next note that if B and j are any maps such that $\mathcal{D}\left(B\right)$ is finite and $\mathcal{R}\left(B\right)\subseteq\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right)$ holds, $\mathcal{D}\left(j\right)$ is finite and $\mathcal{R}\left(j\right)\subseteq\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)$ holds, the condition on page 172 holds for B and j, and if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$, and T is any $\left(V\cup H\right)$-key of A such that T is *not* a member of V, then there is *no* member β of $\mathcal{D}\left(j\right)$ such that $j_\beta\in T$ holds, and if $\tilde{B}$ is defined in terms on B, as on page 208, by *deleting* from B all members $\left(\alpha,B_\alpha\right)$ of B such that B_α is a member of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$, and *retaining,* as members of $\tilde{B}$, all members $\left(\alpha,B_\alpha\right)$ of B such that B_α is a member of $\left(Q\vdash G\right)=\left(\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right)\vdash\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)\right)$, (so that, as noted on page 209, $\tilde{B}$ and j satisfy the condition on page 172 when that condition is modified to apply just to the members A of $\left(Q\vdash G\right)=\left(\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right)\vdash\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)\right)$ rather than to all members A of $\mathbb{B}\left(Q\right)$), and if C is any member of $\left(Y\vdash G\right)$, and if $\tilde{\tilde{B}}_C$ is defined in terms of $\tilde{B}$ as on page 211 to be the map that is the subset of the map $\tilde{B}$ that includes precisely all the members $\left(\alpha, \tilde{B}_{\alpha}\right)$ of $\tilde{B}$ such that $\tilde{B}_{\alpha} \in (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, C)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G, C))$ holds, (or in other words, such that $\mathcal{Y}\left((G \cup Y), \tilde{B}_{\alpha}\right) = C$ holds), and if $\tilde{j}_C$ is defined in terms of j as on page 211 to be the map that is the subset of the map j that includes precisely all the members (β, j_{β}) of j such that j_{β} is a member of $\mathcal{U}(W)$, and the unique member $\mathcal{C}(W, j_{\beta})$ of W that has j_{β} as a member, satisfies the requirement that $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), \mathcal{C}(W, j_{\beta})) = C$ holds, (or in other words, such that j_{β} is a member of $\mathcal{U}\left(\tilde{W}_C\right)$), and if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(Q) \cap (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, C)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G, C))$, then the condition on page 172 for A depends on B and j *only* through the maps $\tilde{\tilde{B}}_C$ and $\tilde{j}_C$, (which are subsets of the maps B and j respectively), and furthermore the condition on page 172 for A is equivalent to the modification of the condition on page 172 for A, obtained by replacing, in the condition on page 172 for A, all occurrences of the map B by the map $\tilde{\tilde{B}}_C$, and all occurrences of the map j by the map $\tilde{j}_C$. For the condition on page 172 for A only depends on the map B through the number of members α of $\mathcal{D}(B)$ such that $B_{\alpha} \in (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(P, A))$ holds, and $A \in (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, C)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G, C))$ and $G \subseteq P$ together imply that $(\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(P, A)) \subseteq (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, C)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G, C))$ holds, (for if D is any member of $(\Xi(\mathcal{P}(P, A)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(P, A))$, then D is a subset of A hence D is a subset of C, and each member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ either does not intersect D or else is a *strict* subset of D, and if E is any member of $\mathcal{P}(G, C)$, then either $E \cap A = \emptyset$ holds or else $E \subset A$ holds, and if $E \cap A = \emptyset$ holds then $E \cap D = \emptyset$ holds, while if $E \subset A$ holds, then since E is a member of G hence a member of P, page 23 implies that E is a subset of a unique member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, and if that unique member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ does not intersect D, then $E \cap D = \emptyset$ holds, while if that unique member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$ is a strict subset of D, then $E \subset D$ holds), hence every such member α of $\mathcal{D}(B)$ is a member of $\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{\tilde{B}}_C\right)$, and the condition on page 172 for A only depends on the map j through the number of members β of $\mathcal{D}(j)$ such that $j_{\beta} \in \mathcal{U}(W)$ and $\{\mathcal{Z}(P, H, j_{\beta}), \mathcal{Z}(P, H, l)\} \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$ both hold, where l is the other member of the unique member $\mathcal{C}(W, j_{\beta})$ of W that has j_{β} as a member, and the facts that $G \subseteq P$ holds and A is a member of $(\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, C)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G, C))$ together imply that every member $\{r, s\}$ of W such that $\{\mathcal{Z}(P, H, r), \mathcal{Z}(P, H, s)\} \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$ holds, is such that $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), \{r, s\}) = C$ holds, hence is such that $\{r, s\}$ is a member of $\tilde{W}_C$, (for $\{\mathcal{Z}(P, H, r), \mathcal{Z}(P, H, s)\} \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P, A))$ implies that $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, r)$ is equal to $\mathcal{K}(P, A, r)$ and that $\mathcal{Z}(P, H, s)$ is equal to $\mathcal{K}(P, A, s)$, hence that $\{r, s\}$ is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, and that $\{r, s\}$ *is* a subset of A hence that $\{r, s\}$ is a subset of C, and $A \in (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G,C))$ furthermore implies that if E is any member of $\mathcal{P}(G,C)$, then either $E \cap A = \emptyset$ holds or $E \subset A$ holds, hence by page 23 and the fact that $G \subseteq P$ holds, either $E \cap A = \emptyset$ holds or E is a subset of a unique member of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$, hence $\{r,s\}$ is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(G,C)$, hence, since it follows directly from the definition of Y on page 168, that there is *no* member D of $(Y \vdash G)$ such that $D \subset C$ holds and D is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}(G,C)$, $\mathcal{Y}((G \cup Y), \{r,s\})$ is equal to C), hence every such member β of $\mathcal{D}(j)$, is a member of $\mathcal{D}\left(\tilde{j}_C\right)$.

We shall next show that if C is any member of $(Y \vdash G)$, and if (B,i,j) is any ordered triple of a map B such that $\mathcal{D}(B)$ is finite and $\mathcal{R}(B) \subseteq (Q \cap (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G,C)))$ holds, a map i such that $\mathcal{D}(B) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(i)$ holds and for each member α of $\mathcal{D}(B)$, i_α is a member of B_α, and a map j such that $\mathcal{D}(j)$ is finite and $\mathcal{R}(j) \subseteq \left(\mathcal{U}\left(\tilde{W}_C\right) \cup (C \vdash \mathcal{U}(W))\right)$ holds, such that for each member A of $\mathbb{B}(Q) \cap (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G,C))$, B and j satisfy the condition on page 172 for A, and if ρ is any member of $\mathbb{D}$, then the integral $\overset{\circ}{\bar{I}}_C(B,i,j,\rho)$ is finite and is bounded above by a finite real number, *independent of* ρ, and we note that, by the foregoing, it will immediately follow from this that if (B,i,n,j,s,E,v) is any ordered septuple as on pages 197 and 198, and satisfying the conditions specified on page 197, then the integral $\overset{*}{I}(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho)$, as defined on page 197, is finite and *absolutely* convergent, and is moreover bounded above in magnitude, for all $\rho \in \mathbb{D}$, by a finite, ρ-independent constant.

Let C be any member of $(Y \vdash G)$, let (B,i,j) be any ordered triple of a map B such that $\mathcal{D}(B)$ is finite and $\mathcal{R}(B) \subseteq (Q \cap (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G,C)))$ holds, a map i such that $\mathcal{D}(B) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(i)$ holds and for each member α of $\mathcal{D}(B)$, i_α is a member of B_α, and a map j such that $\mathcal{D}(j)$ is finite and $\mathcal{R}(j) \subseteq \left(\mathcal{U}\left(\tilde{W}_C\right) \cup (C \vdash \mathcal{U}(W))\right)$ holds, such that for each member A of $\mathbb{B}(Q) \cap (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G,C))$, B and j satisfy the condition on page 172 for A, and let ρ be any member of $\mathbb{D}$.

We first note that it follows directly from the facts that $\mathcal{U}(V)$ is $(V \cup H)$-connected and that if E is any member of H such that E intersects *more* than one member of V, then E has *exactly* two members, that $C = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{P}(G,C))$ is $(\mathcal{P}(G,C) \cup H)$-connected and that if E is any member of H such that E intersects *more* than one member of $\mathcal{P}(G,C)$, then E has *exactly* two members, so that the partitions $\mathcal{P}(G,C)$ and H satisfy the relationships assumed to hold, in Theorem 1, between the partition V of Theorem 1, and H.

And we note furthermore that the partition $\tilde{W}_C$, which was defined on page 211 to be the subset of W whose members are all the members $\{r, s\}$ of W such that $\mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G \cup Y\right), \{r, s\}\right) = C$ holds, is equal to the subset of H whose members are all the members E of H such that E intersects exactly two members of $\mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)$, for if $\{r, s\}$ is any member of $\tilde{W}_C$ then $\{r, s\}$ is a subset of C but is *not* a subset of any member of $\mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)$, hence $\{r, s\}$ intersects exactly two members of $\mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)$, and if E is any member of H such that E intersects exactly two members of $\mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)$, then E intersects more than one member of V hence E has exactly two members, hence E intersects exactly two members of V hence E is a member of W, and furthermore E is a subset of C and $\mathcal{Y}\left(\left(G \cup Y\right), E\right) = C$ holds, hence E is a member of $\tilde{W}_C$. Hence the relation between the partition $\tilde{W}_C$ and the partitions $\mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)$ and H, is the same as the relation between the partition W of Theorem 1, and the partitions V and H of Theorem 1.

We define $\tilde{P}_C \equiv \left(P \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)\right)\right)$ and $\tilde{Q}_C \equiv \left(Q \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)\right)\right)$, so that $\tilde{P}_C$ and $\tilde{Q}_C$ are woods of $\mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)$, and we now proceed by exact analogy with steps in Theorem 1.

We first note that, if $\{r, s\}$ is any member of $\tilde{W}_C$, then by page 91 and Lemma 14, and by analogy with page 107, for all members a of $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_C$ such that $\mathcal{E}\left(\tilde{P}_C, \tilde{Q}_C, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow\left(x, \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)\right)\right)\right)$ is not equal to 0,

$$\left|\mu_r\left(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}\left(P, Q, H, \rho\right)\right) - \mu_s\left(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}\left(P, Q, H, \rho\right)\right)\right|^{-\alpha} \leq$$

$$\leq \left(\frac{1}{1 - 2\lambda}\right)^{|\alpha|} \left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,r)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,s)}\right|^{-\alpha}$$

holds for all $\rho \in \mathbb{D}$ and for all finite real numbers α, and we also note that $\mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, r\right)$ is equal to $\mathcal{Z}\left(\tilde{P}_C, H, r\right)$ and that $\mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, s\right)$ is equal to $\mathcal{Z}\left(\tilde{P}_C, H, s\right)$, and we also note that, since both $\mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, r\right)$ and $\mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, s\right)$ are members of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right) = \mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right)$ for some member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\overline{\tilde{P}_C}\right)$, $\left(x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,r)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,s)}\right) = \left(a_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,r)} - a_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,s)}\right)$ holds. (This last observation is true even when C is a $\left(V \cup H\right)$-firm over V component of a member D of $\mathbb{B}\left(G\right)$, and $\{r, s\}$ is a member of $\tilde{W}_C$ such that $\mathcal{Y}\left(P, \{r, s\}\right) = D$ holds, since in that case, by the definition of the wood J on page 173, the smallest member of J to contain $\mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, r\right)$ as a strict subset is equal to the smallest member of J to contain $\mathcal{Z}\left(P, H, s\right)$ as a strict subset.)

We next use the above inequality, by analogy with pages 107 and 108, to bound the integrand of $\overset{\circ}{\bar{\bar{I}}}_C\left(B, i, j, \rho\right)$ by a product of finite real numbers, independent of ρ and the a_K, times a new integrand in which all occurrences of $|\mu_r(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho)) - \mu_s(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))|$ for any member $\{r,s\}$ of $\tilde{W}_C$ have been replaced by the corresponding $\left|a_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,r)} - a_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,s)}\right|$, (together with a factor $(1-2\lambda)$ inside the step function $\mathbb{S}$, as on page 108).

We then proceed, by analogy with pages 108 and 109, to bound our new integrand by the sum of a finite number of terms, in each of which, for every member α of $\mathcal{D}(B)$, the factor $\left|x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,B_\alpha,i_\alpha)} - x_{B_\alpha}\right|$ associated with the member α of $\mathcal{D}(B)$, has been replaced by some choice of a factor $|x_K - x_L| = |a_K - a_L|$, where both K and L are members of $\mathcal{P}(P,B_\alpha) = \mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, B_\alpha\right)$.

We next consider an arbitrarily chosen such term, and define, by analogy with page 110, α to be the map whose domain is $\bigcup_{A\in\mathbb{B}\left(\tilde{P}_C\right)} \mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right)\right) = \bigcup_{A\in\mathbb{B}\left(\tilde{P}_C\right)} \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{P}(P,A))$, and such that for each member $\{K,L\}$ of $\mathcal{D}(\alpha)$, $\alpha_{\{K,L\}}$ is equal to the negative of the total power of $|x_K - x_L| = |a_K - a_L|$ in the integrand for this term, excluding the $\mathcal{E}$ function and the step-function factors. Then for each member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\tilde{P}_C\right)$, α is a set of powers for A, and, as on page 111, the integrand for this term is equal to a finite real number, independent of ρ and the a_K, times the $\mathcal{E}$ function, times the step-function factors, times the product, over the members A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\tilde{P}_C\right)$, of the factor $\Psi\left(\downarrow\left(x,\mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C,A\right)\right),\alpha\right) = \Psi(\downarrow(x,\mathcal{P}(P,A)),\alpha)$, where we note that in this factor, every interval $|x_K - x_L|$, $\{K,L\} \in \mathcal{P}(P,A)$, is equal to the corresponding interval $|a_K - a_L|$. (We may write the factor $\Psi(\downarrow(x,\mathcal{P}(P,A)),\alpha)$ as $\Psi(\downarrow(a,\mathcal{P}(P,A)),\alpha)$, if we note that for the particular member S_A of $\mathcal{P}(P,A)$, a_{S_A} is identically equal to 0.)

We next note, by the condition on page 172 for the members A of $\mathbb{B}(Q)\cap(\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G,C)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G,C))$, and by analogy with pages 111 and 112, and taking into account that for each member A of $(\Xi(V) \vdash V)$, the present definition of D_A, given on page 166, differs from the definition of D_A in Theorem 1 by the inclusion, in the contribution associated with the member $\{r,s\}$ of $(W \cap \mathcal{Q}(A))$, of the term $(\nu_{gr} + \nu_{gs})$ that takes into account the differential operator $\left(\prod_{\alpha\in\mathcal{D}(g)} c_\alpha \cdot \hat{y}_{g_\alpha}\right)$ in the integrand of the integral on page 167, where g is the map introduced on page 165, that if A is any member of $\left(\tilde{Q}_C \vdash \tilde{P}_C\right)$, then in exact correspondence with observation 19) on pages 119 and 120, the following inequality holds for $\Gamma\left(\alpha,\mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C,A\right)\right) = \Gamma(\alpha,\mathcal{P}(P,A))$:

$$\Gamma(\alpha,\mathcal{P}(P,A)) \leq d(\#(\mathcal{P}(P,A)) - 1) - 1 - \sum_{C\in(\mathcal{P}(P,A)\vdash V)} \left(D_C - \sum_{(i,B)\in\mathbb{I}_C(Q,H)} u_{iB}\right),$$

and if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(\tilde{P}_C\right)$, then in exact correspondence with observation 20) on page 120, the following inequality holds for $\Gamma\left(\alpha, \mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right)\right) = \Gamma\left(\alpha, \mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right)$:

$$\Gamma\left(\alpha, \mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right) \leq \left(d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)\right) - 1\right) + D_A - \left(\sum_{C \in \left(\mathcal{P}(P,A) \vdash V\right)} D_C\right) + \right.$$

$$\left. + \left(\sum_{C \in \left(\mathcal{P}(P,A) \vdash V\right)} \quad \sum_{(i,B) \in \left(\mathbb{I}_C(Q,H) \vdash \mathbb{I}_A(Q,H)\right)} u_{iB}\right) - \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(A,H)} \quad \sum_{B \in \mathbb{Y}(Q,\mathcal{K}(P,A,i),A)} u_{iB}\right)\right).$$

We next note, by Lemma 10, and by analogy with page 121, that if a is any member of $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_C$ such that $\mathcal{E}\left(\tilde{P}_C, \tilde{Q}_C, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow\left(x, \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)\right)\right)\right)$ is not equal to 0, and A is any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(\tilde{P}_C\right)$, then $\mathbb{M}\left(\left(\tilde{P}_C \vdash \{A\}\right), \tilde{P}_C, H, A, \sigma, R, x\right)$ does *not* hold, which implies, by analogy with pages 121 to 123, and noting that $\mathbb{L}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A, x\right)$ is equal to $\mathbb{L}\left(P, A, x\right)$, that either $\mathbb{L}\left(P, A, x\right) \geq R$ holds, or else there exists a member D of $\mathcal{P}\left(P, E\right)$, where E is the smallest member E of $\overline{\tilde{P}_C}$ to contain A as a *strict* subset, such that $D \neq A$ holds, $\mathbb{L}\left(P, A, x\right) \geq \sigma\left|x_A - x_D\right|$ holds, and there exists a member T of $\tilde{W}_C$ such that T intersects both A and D, (and we note that if A is equal to C, then *no* member of $\overline{\tilde{P}_C}$ contains A as a *strict* subset, hence $\mathbb{L}\left(P, A, x\right) \geq R$ holds if A is equal to C).

We now define r, *exactly* as on page 122, to be the member of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{B}(P)}$ such that for each member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)$,

$$r_A \equiv \left(D_A - \sum_{(i,B) \in \mathbb{I}_A(Q,H)} u_{iB}\right) + \frac{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(P\right) \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(V, A\right)\right)\right)}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)},$$

where we note that $\mathbb{B}\left(P\right) \cap \Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(V, A\right)\right)$ is the set of all the members B of $\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)$ such that $B \subseteq A$ holds, and we note that, as observed on page 122, $r_A \geq 0$ holds for every member A of $\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)$.

We now bound our present integrand, by analogy with pages 121 to 124, by a sum of a finite number of terms, each of which has the form of our present integrand, times the product, over the members A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\tilde{P}_C\right)$, of a factor $\left(\frac{n_A}{d_A}\right)^{r_A}$, where n_A is equal to $\left|x_K - x_L\right| = \left|a_K - a_L\right|$ for some choice of a member $\{K, L\}$ of $\mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right) = \mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$, and d_A is either equal to R or else is equal to $\sigma\left|x_A - x_D\right| = \sigma\left|a_A - a_D\right|$ for some choice of a member D of $\mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, E\right) = \mathcal{P}\left(P, E\right)$ such that $D \neq A$ holds and there exists a member T of $\tilde{W}_C$ such that T intersects both A and D, where E is the smallest member of $\overline{\tilde{P}_C}$ to contain A as a *strict* subset, (and if $A = C$ holds then d_A is equal to R).

We next consider an arbitrarily chosen one of these terms, and define, by analogy with page 123, β to be the map whose domain is equal to $\mathcal{D}(\alpha) = \bigcup_{A \in \mathbb{B}\left(\tilde{P}_C\right)} \mathcal{Q}\left(\mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right)\right)$, and such that for each member $\{K, L\}$ of $\mathcal{D}(\beta) = \mathcal{D}(\alpha)$, $\beta_{\{K,L\}}$ is equal to $\alpha_{\{K,L\}}$ plus the negative of the total power of $|x_K - x_L| = |a_K - a_L|$ that occurs in the *new* factors in our chosen term. Then just as on pages 123 and 124, the integrand of our chosen term is equal to a finite real number, independent of ρ and the a_K, times the $\mathcal{E}$ function, times the step-function factors, times the product, over the members A of $\mathbb{B}\left(\tilde{P}_C\right)$, of the factor $\Psi\left(\downarrow\left(a, \mathcal{P}(P, A)\right), \beta\right)$, where we note, as on page 216, that for the particular member S_A of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$, a_{S_A} is identically equal to 0.

We next note that if A is any member of $(\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, C)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G, C))$, hence in particular if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(\tilde{Q}_C\right) = \left(\tilde{Q}_C \vdash \mathcal{P}(G, C)\right)$, then $\mathcal{P}(P, A) \cap V$ is a subset of $\mathcal{P}(P, A) \cap \mathcal{P}(G, C)$, for if D is any member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A) \cap V$, then D is a strict subset of A hence D is a strict subset of C, and D is a member of V hence D is a member of G, hence by page 23, D is a subset of a unique member of $\mathcal{P}(G, C)$. Let E be the unique member of $\mathcal{P}(G, C)$ such that $D \subseteq E$ holds. Then since A is a member of $(\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, C)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G, C))$, either $E \cap A = \emptyset$ holds or else $E \subset A$ holds, and $E \cap A$ has the nonempty subset D, hence $E \subset A$ holds. Hence, since $D \subset E$ and $E \subset A$ cannot *both* hold, (since E is a member of G hence E is a member of P, and D is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A)$), $D = E$ holds, hence D is a member of $\mathcal{P}(G, C)$, hence D is a member of $\mathcal{P}(P, A) \cap \mathcal{P}(G, C)$.

And we note furthermore that it follows immediately from the preceding paragraph, that if A is any member of $(\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, C)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G, C))$, hence in particular, if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(\tilde{Q}_C\right)$, then $(\mathcal{P}(P, A) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G, C))$ is a subset of $(\mathcal{P}(P, A) \vdash V)$.

We next note that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(\tilde{P}_C\right)$, then by analogy with observations 22) to 24) on page 124, the contribution to $\Gamma\left(\beta, \mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right)\right)$ from the *new* factors in our chosen term is $\leq \left(\sum_{D \in (\mathcal{P}(P,A) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G,C))} r_D\right) - r_A$, hence since, as noted on page 216, $r_D \geq 0$ holds for *every* member D of $\mathbb{B}(P)$, and, as just shown, $(\mathcal{P}(P, A) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G, C))$ is a subset of $(\mathcal{P}(P, A) \vdash V)$, the contribution to $\Gamma\left(\beta, \mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right)\right)$ from the *new* factors in our chosen term is $\leq \left(\sum_{D \in (\mathcal{P}(P,A) \vdash V)} r_D\right) - r_A$, exactly as in observation 24) on page 124. Hence by the foregoing, and by observations 24) and 25) on pages 124 and 125, if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(\tilde{P}_C\right)$, then since $\mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right) = \mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$ holds, the following inequality holds:

$$\Gamma\left(\beta, \mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right)\right) \leq d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right)\right) - 1\right) - \frac{1}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)}.$$

And we note furthermore that if A is any member of $\left(\tilde{Q}_C \vdash \tilde{P}_C\right)$, then by analogy with observation 23) on page 124 and observation 26) on page 125, the contribution to $\Gamma\left(\beta, \mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right)\right)$ from the *new* factors in our chosen term is $\leq \left(\sum_{D \in (\mathcal{P}(P,A) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G,C))} r_D\right)$, hence again since $r_D \geq 0$ holds for *all* members D of $\mathbb{B}\left(P\right)$, and $\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right) \vdash \mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)\right)$ is a subset of $\left(\mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right) \vdash V\right)$, the contribution to $\Gamma\left(\beta, \mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right)\right)$ from the *new* factors in our chosen term is $\leq \left(\sum_{D \in (\mathcal{P}(P,A) \vdash V)} r_D\right)$, exactly as in observation 26) on page 125. Hence by the foregoing, and by observations 26) and 27) on pages 125 and 126, if A is any member of $\left(\tilde{Q}_C \vdash \tilde{P}_C\right)$, then since $\mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right) = \mathcal{P}\left(P, A\right)$ holds, the following inequality holds for $\Gamma\left(\beta, \mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right)\right)$:

$$\Gamma\left(\beta, \mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right)\right) \leq d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right)\right) - 1\right) - \frac{1}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)}.$$

Hence if A is *any* member of $\mathbb{B}\left(\tilde{Q}_C\right)$, then exactly as in observation 28) on page 126, the following inequality holds for $\Gamma\left(\beta, \mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right)\right)$:

$$\Gamma\left(\beta, \mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right)\right) \leq d\left(\#\left(\mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right)\right) - 1\right) - \frac{1}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)}.$$

We may now complete the proof of the absolute convergence of $\overset{\circ}{\bar{I}}_C\left(B, i, j, \rho\right)$, and a ρ-independent bound on the magnitude of $\overset{\circ}{\bar{I}}_C\left(B, i, j, \rho\right)$, by exact analogy with the remainder of the proof of Theorem 1, taking V, W, P, and Q of Theorem 1 respectively as our present $\mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)$, $\tilde{W}_C$, $\tilde{P}_C$, and $\tilde{Q}_C$ respectively, with the only changes being firstly the fact that we have $-\frac{1}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)\right)}$ rather than $-\frac{1}{\#\left(\mathbb{B}\left(\overline{\tilde{P}_C}\right)\right)}$ in the bound just obtained on $\Gamma\left(\beta, \mathcal{P}\left(\tilde{P}_C, A\right)\right)$, and this requires *no* changes to the procedure of proof, and secondly that since, by page 211, we are already using the a_K variables, $K \in \left(\left(P \cap \left(\Xi\left(\mathcal{P}\left(G, C\right)\right) \vdash \left\{C\right\}\right)\right) \vdash \left(\mathcal{R}\left(S\right) \cup \left\{\mathcal{U}\left(V\right)\right\}\right)\right)$, or in other words,

$K \in \left(\tilde{P}_C \vdash (\mathcal{R}(S) \cup \{C\})\right)$, there is no need to make any change of variables corresponding to the change to the z_K variables on pages 127 to 130.

We next note that if C is any member of $(Y \vdash G)$, then since, by pages 183 to 185, when the x_L variables are expressed in terms of the a_D variables, their only ρ-dependence is through the coefficients ν_{KD}, and since the factors $\mathcal{E}\left(\tilde{P}_C, \tilde{Q}_C, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow (x, \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, C)))\right)$ and $\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,N,l)} - x_N\right)$, where N is any member of $(Q \cap (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, C)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G, C)))$ and l is any member of N, depend on the x_L variables only through linear combinations, each with the sum of all its coefficients being equal to 0, of the x_L, $L \in \mathcal{P}(G, C)$, and since, again by pages 183 to 185, when any x_L variable, $L \in \mathcal{P}(G, C)$, is expressed in terms of the a_D variables, the only terms which occur that depend on any of the ν_{KD} coefficients, are terms that occur identically in *every* x_L, $L \in \mathcal{P}(G, C)$, these factors, $\mathcal{E}\left(\tilde{P}_C, \tilde{Q}_C, H, \sigma, R, \downarrow (x, \Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, C)))\right)$ and $\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(Q,N,l)} - x_N\right)$, where N is any member of $(Q \cap (\Xi(\mathcal{P}(G, C)) \vdash \mathcal{P}(G, C)))$ and l is any member of N, are *completely independent of* ρ when they are expressed in terms of the a_D variables. Hence if (B, i, j) is any ordered *triple* as on page 214, and satisfying the conditions, with reference to C, specified for the ordered *triple* (B, i, j) on page 214, then the ρ-independence of our bound on $\overset{\circ}{\tilde{I}}_C(B, i, j, \rho)$ was in fact attained immediately we had carried out the step, on pages 215 and 216, of replacing all occurrences of $|\mu_r(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho)) - \mu_s(P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X}(P, Q, H, \rho))|$ by the corresponding $\left|a_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,r)} - a_{\mathcal{Z}(P,H,s)}\right|$ for each member $\{r, s\}$ of $\tilde{W}_C$.

This completes the first of the two steps mentioned on page 197, namely the proof that if (B, i, n, j, s, E, v) is any ordered septuple as on page 197, and satisfying the conditions specified on page 197, then the integral $\overset{*}{I}(B, i, n, j, s, E, v, \rho)$ defined on page 197, is finite and *absolutely* convergent, and is moreover bounded in magnitude, for all $\rho \in \mathbb{D}$, by a finite, ρ-independent constant.

Finally we shall carry out the second of the two steps mentioned on page 197, by showing that the result just obtained, together with our assumptions on the map $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ and its relation to the map $\mathcal{J}$, imply that if (B, i, n, j, s, E, v) is any ordered septuple as on page 197, and satisfying the conditions specified on page 197, then the integrals with respect to ρ, over $\mathbb{D}$, of any k-independent product of finite powers, all ≥ 0 and independent of k and ρ, of the ρ_K, $K \in (Q \vdash P)$, times the $\overset{\circ}{I}_k(B, i, n, j, s, E, v, \rho)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, form a Cauchy sequence.

Let (B, i, n, j, s, E, v) be any ordered septuple as on page 197, and satisfying the conditions specified on page 197, and let ρ be any member of $\mathbb{D}$.

Now for each member k of $\mathbb{N}$, $\overset{\circ}{I}_k(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho)$, as defined on page 171, is obtained from $\overset{*}{I}(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho)$, as defined on page 197, by replacing the $\mathcal{J}_Q(y)$ that occurs in the integrand of $\overset{*}{I}(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho)$, by $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kQ}(y)$. Hence since, by assumption, and for every member k of $\mathbb{N}$, $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kQ}(y)$ satisfies all the assumptions made for $\mathcal{J}_Q(y)$, it immediately follows from our proof of the finiteness and *absolute* convergence of $\overset{*}{I}(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho)$, that for every member k of $\mathbb{N}$, $\overset{\circ}{I}_k(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho)$ is finite and *absolutely* convergent, and moreover satisfies the *same* ρ-independent bound on its magnitude that we obtained for $\overset{*}{I}(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho)$.

We shall next show that if ε is any given real number > 0, then there exists a member k of $\mathbb{N}$, *independent of* ρ, such that for all members l of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $l \geq k$ holds, and for all members ρ of $\mathbb{D}$, $\left|\overset{\circ}{I}_l(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho) - \overset{*}{I}(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho)\right| \leq \varepsilon$ holds.

We first note that, by assumption, for any given real number $\delta > 0$ and for any given real number $r > 0$, there exists a member k of $\mathbb{N}$ such that for all members l of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $l \geq k$ holds, and for all members y of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)}$ such that $|y_e - y_f| \geq r$ holds for all members $\{e,f\}$ of W, and for all maps t and u such that $\mathcal{D}(t)$ is finite, $\#(\mathcal{D}(t)) \leq N$ holds, (where N is the integer defined on page 166), $\mathcal{R}(t) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(V)$ holds, $\mathcal{D}(t) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(u)$ holds, and for each member α of $\mathcal{D}(t)$, u_α is a unit d-vector, $\left|\left(\prod_{\alpha\in\mathcal{D}(t)} u_\alpha.\hat{y}_{t_\alpha}\right)\left(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{lQ}(y) - \mathcal{J}_Q(y)\right)\right| \leq \delta$ holds.

We next note, by analogy with pages 126 and 127, and pages 207 to 210, that the total $d(\#(V)-1)$-volume of the subset of $\mathbb{W}$ where our integrands are not *forced* to be equal to 0 by our assumption that $\mathcal{J}_Q(y)$, (and consequently also all the $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{kQ}(y)$), vanishes whenever $|y_e - y_f| \geq T$ holds for any member $\{e,f\}$ of W, is *finite,* and is moreover bounded above by a finite real number, independent of ρ, times $T^{d(\#(V)-1)}$.

And we observe furthermore that if ρ is any member of $\mathbb{D}$, then by the preceding paragraph and by analogy with page 101, and by the facts that for any member $\{e,f\}$ of W, $\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,e) \cap \mathcal{Z}(Q,H,f) = \emptyset$ holds, and $\mu_e(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))$ is equal to a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of x_K for the members K of P such that $K \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q,H,e)$ holds and there is *no* member M of P such that $K \subset M \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q,H,e)$ holds, and $\mu_f(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))$ is equal to a linear combination, with coefficients summing to 1, of x_L for the members L of P such that $L \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q,H,f)$ holds and there is *no* member M of P such that $L \subset M \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(Q,H,f)$ holds, (so that there is *no* member U of P such that x_U occurs with nonzero coefficient in *both* $\mu_e(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))$ *and* $\mu_f(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}(P,Q,H,\rho))$), the subset of

$\mathbb{W}$ whose members are all the members x of $\mathbb{W}$ such that

$$\left|\mu_e\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)-\mu_f\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)\right|\leq T$$

holds for *all* members $\{e,f\}$ of W *and*

$$\left|\mu_e\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)-\mu_f\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)\right|=0$$

holds for *at least one* member $\{e,f\}$ of W, may be enclosed in an open subset of $\mathbb{W}$ whose $d\left(\#\left(V\right)-1\right)$-volume is not greater than any *given* real number that is >0, and furthermore if δ is any given real number >0, then there exists a real number $r>0$ such that the subset of $\mathbb{W}$ whose members are all the members x of $\mathbb{W}$ such that

$$\left|\mu_e\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)-\mu_f\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)\right|\leq T$$

holds for *all* members $\{e,f\}$ of W *and*

$$\left|\mu_e\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)-\mu_f\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)\right|<r$$

holds for *at least one* member $\{e,f\}$ of W, has $d\left(\#\left(V\right)-1\right)$-volume not greater than δ.

Hence by analogy with Lemma 23, it directly follows from the assumed properties of the maps $\mathcal{J}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$, together with our proof of the *absolute* convergence of $\overset{*}{I}\left(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho\right)$ and our ρ-independent bound on the magnitude of $\overset{*}{I}\left(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho\right)$, that if δ is any given real number >0, then there exists a real number $r>0$, *independent of* ρ, such that for all $\rho\in\mathbb{D}$, the contribution to $\overset{*}{I}\left(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho\right)$ from the subset of $\mathbb{W}$ whose members are all the members x of $\mathbb{W}$ such that

$$\left|\mu_e\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)-\mu_f\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)\right|<r$$

holds for *at least one* member $\{e,f\}$ of W, is not greater than δ, *and* such that for all $\rho\in\mathbb{D}$ and for all $k\in\mathbb{N}$, the contribution to $\overset{\circ}{I}_k\left(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho\right)$ from that same subset of $\mathbb{W}$, is also not greater than δ.

So if ε is any given real number >0, we choose, by the preceding paragraph, a real number $r>0$, independent of ρ, such that for all $\rho\in\mathbb{D}$, the contribution to $\overset{*}{I}\left(B,i,n,j,s,E,v,\rho\right)$ from the subset of $\mathbb{W}$ whose members are all the members x of $\mathbb{W}$ such that

$$\left|\mu_e\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)-\mu_f\left(P,Q,H,x,\mathcal{X}\left(P,Q,H,\rho\right)\right)\right|<r$$

holds for *at least one* member $\{e, f\}$ of W, is not greater than $\frac{\varepsilon}{3}$, *and* such that for all $\rho \in \mathbb{D}$ and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the contribution to $\overset{\circ}{I}_k (B, i, n, j, s, E, v, \rho)$ from that same subset of $\mathbb{W}$, is also not greater than $\frac{\varepsilon}{3}$.

And we then use the assumption mentioned in the third paragraph on page 221, taking the r of that assumption to be equal to the r we have just chosen, and the δ of that assumption to be equal to ε divided by (3 times an upper bound, independent of ρ, on the $d (\# (V) - 1)$-volume of the subset of $\mathbb{W}$ whose members are all the members x of $\mathbb{W}$ such that

$$|\mu_e (P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X} (P, Q, H, \rho)) - \mu_f (P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X} (P, Q, H, \rho))| \leq T$$

holds for every member $\{e, f\}$ of W, (obtained by Lemma 14 and by analogy with pages 126 and 127, and pages 207 to 210, as mentioned on page 221), times the product, over the members α of $\mathcal{D} (B)$, of an upper bound, independent of ρ, on $\left| x_{\mathcal{K}(Q, B_\alpha, i_\alpha)} - x_{B_\alpha} \right|$, for all members x of $\mathbb{W}$ such that

$$|\mu_e (P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X} (P, Q, H, \rho)) - \mu_f (P, Q, H, x, \mathcal{X} (P, Q, H, \rho))| \leq T$$

holds for every member $\{e, f\}$ of W, (again obtained by Lemma 14 and by analogy with pages 126 and 127, and pages 207 to 210)).

And by the foregoing and that assumption, with the r and δ of that assumption taken as just specified, we find by that assumption a member k of $\mathbb{N}$, *independent of* ρ, such that for all members l of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $l \geq k$ holds, and for all members ρ of $\mathbb{D}$,

$$\left| \overset{\circ}{I}_l (B, i, n, j, s, E, v, \rho) - \overset{*}{I} (B, i, n, j, s, E, v, \rho) \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} = \varepsilon$$

holds.

And it follows immediately from this, together with our ρ-independent bound on the magnitudes of $\overset{*}{I} (B, i, n, j, s, E, v, \rho)$ and all the $\overset{\circ}{I}_k (B, i, n, j, s, E, v, \rho)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, that the integrals with respect to ρ, over $\mathbb{D}$, of any k-independent product of finite powers, all ≥ 0 and independent of k and ρ, of the ρ_K, $K \in (Q \vdash P)$, times the $\overset{\circ}{I}_k (B, i, n, j, s, E, v, \rho)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, form a Cauchy sequence, and this completes the proof of Theorem 2.

8 Applications.

When the position-space R-operation is applied to a single Feynman subdiagram whose vertex positions are represented by the member x of $\mathbb{E}_d^V$, where V is a finite set that has one member for each vertex of the diagram, the unrenormalized integrand usually has the form of a sum of a finite number of terms, each of which has the form of a product of an internal function $I(x)$ and an external function $E(x)$. The internal function $I(x)$ is assumed to depend on no position variables other than the x_A, $A \in V$, whereas the external function $E(x)$ may depend also on other position variables that are not involved in the renormalization of the subdiagram represented by the finite set V. The internal propagators of the subdiagram are included in $I(x)$, but whether any other factors that occur are included in $I(x)$ or in $E(x)$ may depend on the application. For example, any propagators with one end in the subdiagram represented by V and their other end *not* in the subdiagram represented by V, will be included as factors in $E(x)$, (and if the positions of their outer ends have not been integrated over, they will be among the undisplayed position variables on which $E(x)$ may depend), while position-dependent coupling constants might be included in $I(x)$, and position-dependent background classical fields might be included in $E(x)$. There may also be, for example, functions forming part of a smooth partition of unity, introduced for technical reasons in the course of calculations.

The position-space R-operation for a single such term consists of either leaving $I(x)$ unaltered, or else replacing it by a function $\tilde{I}(x)$ that is identical to $I(x)$ when all $|x_A - x_B|$, $\{A, B\} \in \mathcal{Q}(V)$, are small enough, (for example, in our Theorems, smaller than a fixed real number $S > 0$), but which may differ from $I(x)$ by the inclusion of sufficiently smooth *long-distance* cutoffs, and replacing $E(x)$ by its Taylor expansion, up to a certain finite degree, about a member $\tilde{x}$ of $\mathbb{E}_d^V$, where $\tilde{x}_A \equiv \sum_{B \in V} \lambda_B x_B$ holds for *all* members A of V, where the λ_B, $B \in V$, are real numbers, depending on V and on B but on *nothing else,* such that $\sum_{B \in V} \lambda_B \equiv 1$ holds. (For our convergence Theorems we also assume that $\lambda_B \geq 0$ holds for every member B of V, so that $\sum_{B \in V} \lambda_B x_B$ is a member of the convex hull of the x_A, $A \in V$.)

The R-operation algebra is most conveniently carried out by introducing independent variables $y_i \in \mathbb{E}_d$ for all the separate factors making up the unrenormalized Feynman integrand, (for example, an independent variable $y_i \in \mathbb{E}_d$ for each propagator end, an independent variable $y_i \in \mathbb{E}_d$ for each position-dependent classical field or background field, and an independent variable $y_i \in \mathbb{E}_d$ for each position-dependent coupling constant), and when we do this, it is natural to take the set V representing the vertices to be a *partition,* such that the members of the member of V corresponding to a given vertex of the Feynman diagram correspond to all the separate propagator ends that meet at that vertex in the unrenormalized Feynman diagram, together with any other variables, (such as position-dependent coupling constants), associated with that vertex. (This in fact arises naturally from the perturbation expansion that generates the sum of Feynman diagrams.) Then, as noted on page 21, each nonempty subset of the partition V corresponds to a member of $\Xi(V)$.

In our Theorems we include all the factors making up the integrand of the unrenormalized Feynman diagram, (or all the factors making up one of the finite number of terms in that integrand), into a single function $\mathcal{J}_V(y)$, $y \in \mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)}$, where V is a partition that has one member for each vertex of the Feynman diagram, and the members of the member of V that corresponds to any given vertex of the Feynman diagram, may be taken as corresponding to all the independent position variables or factors associated with that vertex, as just described, and we assume that the information that determines which of the members i of a given member of V are internal to, and which are external to, a given subdiagram that includes the vertex corresponding to that member of V, is coded into the partition H, and interpreted by the function $\mathcal{T}(A,H)$, as defined on page 25, where A is the member of $\Xi(V)$ corresponding to that subdiagram, (so A is equal to the union of the members of V associated with the vertices of that subdiagram). Specifically, a member i of A is treated as corresponding to an argument of the *internal* function of the subdiagram associated with A if i is a member of $(A \vdash \mathcal{T}(A,H))$, (or in other words, if there *does* exist a member B of H such that $i \in B$ and $B \subseteq A$ both hold), and a member i of A is treated as corresponding to an argument of the *external* function of the subdiagram associated with A if i is a member of $\mathcal{T}(A,H)$, (or in other words, if there is *no* member B of H such that $i \in B$ and $B \subseteq A$ both hold). Propagators correspond to two-member members of H; position-dependent coupling constants, if they are required to be included in the *internal* function of *every* subdiagram that includes the vertex they are associated with, may be coded as one-member members of H; and any members i of $\mathcal{U}(V)$ such that their corresponding variable y_i is required to be treated as an argument of the *external* function of every subdiagram whose associated member of $\Xi(V)$ has i as a member, may be identified as members of $\mathcal{U}(V)$ that are either not members of *any* member of H, or else are not members of any member of H that is a subset of $\mathcal{U}(V)$.

In QCD it is sometimes necessary to impose *long-distance* cutoffs on the internal propagators of a counterterm in order to avoid *long-distance* divergences in that counterterm. These *long-distance* cutoffs on the propagators inside counterterms determine the strong-interaction mass scale, and they are the reason for allowing the replacement of the internal function $I(x)$ of a single renormalized subdiagram by a modified function $\tilde{I}(x)$ as on page 224 above. (Ward identities may be restored at each order of perturbation theory by the addition of finite counterterms of non-BRS-invariant structure.)

It may be sufficient, for QCD, to have just two versions of each propagator, (one with, and one without, the long-distance cutoff), but in our R-operation we allow, each time we contract a new subdiagram, the replacement of each internal propagator of that subdiagram that is *not* an internal propagator of any previously contracted subdiagram, by a modified version of that propagator that agrees with the unmodified version whenever the positions $y_i \in \mathbb{E}_d$ and $y_j \in \mathbb{E}_d$ of the ends of that propagator are such that $|y_i - y_j| \leq S$ holds, where S is a fixed real number > 0, and we allow the details of the modification to depend on the identity of the subdiagram we are contracting when the modification is made. (We note that this is certainly adequate for QCD.)

Thus if V and H satisfy the assumptions of Theorems 1 and 2, and if W is defined, as on pages 103 and 165, to be the subset of H whose members are all the members E of H such that E intersects exactly two members of V, then for each member $\{i,j\}$ of W, we have the propagator associated with $\{i,j\}$ in the unrenormalized Feynman diagram, which we denote by $G_\emptyset$ and which is a member of $(\mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty, -\infty\})^{\left(\mathbb{E}_d^{\{i,j\}}\right)}$, and we also have, for each member A of $\Xi(V)$ such that A is $(V \cup H)$-connected and $\{i,j\} \subseteq A$ holds, a propagator G_A which is also a member of $(\mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty, -\infty\})^{\left(\mathbb{E}_d^{\{i,j\}}\right)}$. For each member $\{(i, y_i), (j, y_j)\}$ of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\{i,j\}}$, and for each member A of $\{\emptyset\} \cup \Xi(V)$ such that either $A = \emptyset$ holds or else A is $(V \cup H)$-connected and $\{i,j\} \subseteq A$ holds, we define $G_{Aij}(y_i, y_j) \equiv G_{Aji}(y_j, y_i) \equiv (G_A)_{\{(i,y_i),(j,y_j)\}}$. (We note that $\{i,j\}$ may be identified from G_A for any such A by the fact that if y is any member of $\mathcal{D}(G_A)$, then $\{i,j\} = \mathcal{D}(y)$.) We then find, for each wood F of V such that every member of F is $(V \cup H)$-connected, (or in other words, for each member F of $\mathcal{G}(V,H)$), that corresponding to the function $\mathcal{J}_V(y)$ on page 225, we should take the function

$$\mathcal{J}_F(y) \equiv \left(\prod_{\Delta \equiv \{i,j\} \in W} G_{\mathcal{Y}(F,\{i,j\})ij}(y_i, y_j) \right) E\left(\downarrow (y, (\mathcal{U}(V) \vdash \mathcal{U}(W)))\right),$$

where we note that, by the definition on page 24 of the function $\mathcal{Y}$, and for each member $\{i,j\}$ of W, $\mathcal{Y}(F, \{i,j\})$ is equal to the *smallest* member A of F such that $\{i,j\} \subseteq A$

holds, if any members A of F exist such that $\{i,j\} \subseteq A$ holds, and $\mathcal{Y}(F,\{i,j\})$ is equal to $\emptyset$ if there are *no* members A of F such that $\{i,j\} \subseteq A$ holds, and where the factor $E(\downarrow(y,(\mathcal{U}(V) \vdash \mathcal{U}(W))))$ contains all factors making up the particular term under consideration of the integrand of the Feynman diagram under consideration, *other* than the internal propagators of the diagram.

We note that the index F on $\mathcal{J}_F(y)$ thus arises *entirely* because we have allowed propagators to be modified inside a subdiagram when we contract that subdiagram by the R-operation.

(We may avoid, if required, including $+\infty$ and $-\infty$ in the range of the propagators G_A, by defining $G_{Aij}(y_i,y_j)$ to be any arbitrary member of $\mathbb{R}$ on the measure-zero subset of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\{i,j\}}$ whose members are all the members $\{(i,y_i),(j,y_j)\}$ of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\{i,j\}}$ such that $|y_i - y_j| = 0$ holds.)

Now with $\mathcal{J}_F(y)$ defined as above for each member F of $\mathcal{G}(V,H)$, let F and G be any members of $\mathcal{G}(V,H)$, and y be any member of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(V)}$, such that for every member $\{i,j\}$ of W, either $|y_i - y_j| \leq S$ holds or $\mathcal{Y}(F,\{i,j\}) = \mathcal{Y}(G,\{i,j\})$ holds. Then since we assume, for every member $\{i,j\}$ of W, that if A and B are any members of $\{\emptyset\} \cup \Xi(V)$ such that A is either equal to $\emptyset$ or else is $(V \cup H)$-connected and such that $\{i,j\} \subseteq A$ holds, and B is either equal to $\emptyset$ or else is $(V \cup H)$-connected and such that $\{i,j\} \subseteq B$ holds, then $G_{Aij}(y_i,y_j) = G_{Bij}(y_i,y_j)$ holds for all $y_i \in \mathbb{E}_d$ and all $y_j \in \mathbb{E}_d$ such that $|y_i - y_j| \leq S$ holds, we find immediately that $\mathcal{J}_F(y) = \mathcal{J}_G(y)$ holds. Hence the $\mathcal{J}_F(y)$, constructed as above, satisfy the relation that is required to hold among the $\mathcal{J}_F(y)$, for distinct members F of $\mathcal{G}(V,H)$, in Lemma 22, Theorem 1, and Theorem 2.

If oversubtractions are required, they may be obtained in Theorem 1 simply by choosing the integers $\theta_{\{i,j\}}$ to be larger than they are required to be by the actual behaviour of the propagators, while to obtain oversubtractions in Theorem 2, we must, due to the assumption made in Theorem 2 that $\theta_{\{i,j\}} < d$ holds for every member $\{i,j\}$ of W, introduce a second set of integers $\tilde{\theta}_{\{i,j\}}$ such that $\theta_{\{i,j\}} \leq \tilde{\theta}_{\{i,j\}}$ holds for every member $\{i,j\}$ of W, and use the $\tilde{\theta}_{\{i,j\}}$ in place of the $\theta_{\{i,j\}}$ in the definition of the integers D_A on page 166. We may check that this does not affect the proof of Theorem 2, since the *only* use made of the assumption that $\theta_{\{i,j\}} < d$ holds for every member $\{i,j\}$ of W, is to obtain the convergence, on pages 209 to 211, of the integrals over the key ends of the key propagators of the members of $\mathbb{B}(G)$.

We note that the condition $\theta_{\{i,j\}} < d$ imposed on the integers $\theta_{\{i,j\}}$ in Theorem 2, is compensated by the inclusion of the differential operator $\left(\prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{D}(g)} c_\alpha . \hat{y}_{g_\alpha}\right)$, involving the arbitrary maps g and c as on page 165, in the integrand of the integral on page 167. This is consistent with the fact that the power-counting behaviour of Feynman diagrams, including the Feynman diagrams for QCD, arises from core propagators, each of which contributes strictly less than d to the degree of divergence of the diagram, together with derivatives acting on those core propagators, where the derivatives may either act out of the vertices of the unrenormalized diagram, or else may be part of the definition of the propagator. (For example, for $d = 4$ the Proca propagator has terms that contribute +4 to the degree of divergence of a diagram, but those terms have the form of two derivatives acting on a core propagator that only contributes +2 to the degree of divergence of a diagram.)

We do not require translation invariance for either of our Theorems, but for Theorem 2 we require our propagators to have the property that if v is any map such that $\mathcal{D}(v)$ is finite, $\#(\mathcal{D}(v)) \leq N$ holds, where N is the integer defined on page 166, and for each member β of $\mathcal{D}(v)$, v_β is a unit d-vector, then the power-counting behaviour of $\left(\prod_{\beta\in\mathcal{D}(v)}(v_\beta.(\hat{y}_i + \hat{y}_j))\right) G_{Aij}(y_i, y_j)$, as $|y_i - y_j|$ tends to 0, where $\{i, j\}$ is any member of W, is *not worse* than the power-counting behaviour of $G_{Aij}(y_i, y_j)$ as $|y_i - y_j|$ tends to 0. This immediately gives the inequality in the third paragraph of page 167 for the $\mathcal{J}_F(y)$ as defined at the bottom of page 226, provided that the function $E(\downarrow(y, (\mathcal{U}(V) \vdash \mathcal{U}(W))))$ is sufficiently well-behaved.

As an example of this behaviour, which we call "translation smooth", we note that if f is any *completely smooth* function of $x \in \mathbb{E}_d$ and $y \in \mathbb{E}_d$, α is any real number, and u is any unit d-vector, then $(u.\hat{x} + u.\hat{y})\left(f\,|x - y|^{-\alpha}\right)$ is equal to $((u.\hat{x} + u.\hat{y})\,f)\,|x - y|^{-\alpha}$, and that since $((u.\hat{x} + u.\hat{y})\,f)$ is also a completely smooth function of x and y, we may iterate this result any finite number of times with any finite sequence of unit d-vectors.

We recall from page 25 that for any ordered pair (A, H) of a set A, and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathcal{T}(A, H)$ to be the subset of A whose members are all the members i of A such that there is *no* member B of H such that $i \in B$ and $B \subseteq A$ both hold, and we also recall from page 25 that for any ordered pair (F, H) of a wood F, and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathcal{O}(F, H)$ to be the set whose members are all the members i of $\mathcal{U}(F)$ such that there *exists* a member A of F such that $i \in A$ holds and there is *no* member B of H such that $i \in B$ and $B \subseteq A$ both hold, and we recall from page 85 that if F and G are any woods such that $\mathcal{M}(F) = \mathcal{M}(G)$ holds, and H is a set such that every member of H is a set, then $\mathcal{O}(F, H) = \mathcal{O}(G, H)$ holds.

And we recall from page 21 that for any ordered pair (F, i) of a set F such that every member of F is a set, and a member i of $\mathcal{U}(F)$, we define $\mathcal{C}(F, i)$ to be the intersection of all the members A of F such that $i \in A$ holds, and we recall from page 22 that if F is a *wood,* then $\mathcal{C}(F, i)$ is equal to the unique member of $\mathcal{M}(F)$ that has i as a member.

And we recall from page 26 that for any ordered triple (F, A, B) of a wood F, a *nonempty* set A, and a set B, we define $\mathbb{Y}(F, A, B)$ to be the set whose members are all the members C of F such that $A \subset C$ and $C \subseteq B$ both hold, and we note that $\mathbb{Y}(F, A, B)$ is equal to the empty set $\emptyset$ if $A \subset B$ does *not* hold.

And we recall from page 86 that for any ordered pair (F, H) of a wood F and a set H such that every member of H is a set, we define $\mathbb{I}(F, H)$ to be the map whose domain is $\mathbb{B}(F) = (F \vdash \mathcal{M}(F))$, and such that for each member A of $\mathbb{B}(F)$, $\mathbb{I}_A(F, H) \equiv (\mathbb{I}(F, H))_A$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (i, B) of a member i of $\mathcal{T}(A, H)$ and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}(F, \mathcal{C}(F, i), A)$.

And we recall from page 25 that for any ordered triple (F, H, i) of a wood F, a set H such that every member of H is a set, and a member i of $\mathcal{O}(F, H)$, we define $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$ to be the *largest* member A of F such that $i \in A$ holds and there is *no* member B of H such that $i \in B$ and $B \subseteq A$ both hold.

And we note that it follows directly from Lemma 20, with the wood Q of Lemma 20 set equal to the wood F of Lemma 20, and from page 87, that if F is any wood, and H is any set such that every member of H is a set, then $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{I}(F, H)))$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (i, B) of a member i of $\mathcal{O}(F, H)$ and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}(F, \mathcal{C}(F, i), \mathcal{Z}(F, H, i))$.

And we also recall from page 25 that for any ordered triple (F, A, i) of a wood F, a member A of $(\Xi(\mathcal{M}(F)) \vdash \mathcal{M}(F))$, and a member i of A, we define $\mathcal{K}(F, A, i)$ to be the unique member B of $\mathcal{P}(F, A)$ such that $i \in B$ holds.

Now in the position-space R-operation for a subdiagram A, such that $D_A = 0$ holds, the inner ends of the *legs* of A are detached from the vertices of A and shifted to the contraction point x_A of A. And for general D_A the R-operation for A Taylor-expands, up to a specified finite degree $\leq D_A$, the product of the leg functions of A, (or more generally, the *external* function of A), with respect to the positions of their inner ends, *about* the position where all the inner ends are at x_A. The *internal* lines of A are *unaffected* by the position space R-operation for A, apart from possible replacements of the line functions $G_{\emptyset ij}(x, y)$, $x \in \mathbb{E}_d$, $y \in \mathbb{E}_d$, by $G_{Aij}(x, y)$, as described above.

The *position arguments* $x \in \mathbb{E}_d$ and $y \in \mathbb{E}_d$ of the ends of the internal lines of A are *completely unaffected* by the position-space R-operation for A.

Thus the i-end of line $\{i, j\}$, where $\{i, j\}$ is a member of W, gets shifted by the R-operation for every member A of F such that $i \in A$ and $j \notin A$ both hold. Thus if $i \in A$ and $j \notin A$ both hold, then the R-operation for A shifts the i-end of line $\{i, j\}$ from $x_{\mathcal{K}(F,A,i)}$ to x_A.

And the final position of the i-end of line $\{i, j\}$ is the contraction point of the largest member of F that has i as a member but does *not* have j as a member, which, if V, H and W are as in Theorems 1 and 2, so that, in particular, H is a partition, so $\{i, j\}$ is the *only* member of H that has i as a member, and $\{i, j\}$ is *not* a subset of any member of V, will be $x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)}$.

And furthermore, if i is any member of $(\mathcal{U}(V) \vdash \mathcal{O}(V, H)) = (\mathcal{U}(F) \vdash \mathcal{O}(F, H))$, then there is *no* member A of F such that $i \in \mathcal{T}(A, H)$ holds, and i is an argument of the *internal* function for *every* member A of F such that $i \in A$ holds, hence the position argument associated with i does *not* get shifted by the R-operation for *any* member A of F, hence the final position of the position argument associated with i, is $x_{\mathcal{C}(F,i)} = x_{\mathcal{C}(V,i)}$.

Hence for any member i of $\mathcal{U}(V)$, the *final* value of the position argument associated with i, after doing the R-operations for *all* the members of $\mathbb{B}(F)$, where F is any wood of V such that every member of F is $(V \cup H)$-connected, is $\eta_i(F, H, x)$, where for any ordered triple (F, H, x) of a wood F, a set H such that every member of H is a set, and a member x of $\mathbb{F}_d(\mathcal{M}(F))$, where d is an integer ≥ 1, we defined the member $\eta(F, H, x)$ of $\mathbb{E}_d^{\mathcal{U}(F)}$ on page 89 by:

$$\eta_i(F, H, x) \equiv (\eta(F, H, x))_i \equiv \begin{cases} x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{O}(F, H) \\ x_{\mathcal{C}(F,i)} & \text{if } i \in (\mathcal{U}(F) \vdash \mathcal{O}(F, H)) \end{cases}$$

Now to be of practical use for QCD our R-operation must not generate any terms corresponding to counterterms in the action whose total number of derivatives + gluon fields + $\frac{3}{2}$ times quark fields is greater than 4. Therefore, before we assign a degree of divergence to a subdiagram, we must break up the Feynman integrand for the subdiagram into a sum of terms such that in each term, every derivative acting out of a vertex acts on a *specific* line.

Furthermore, when we apply the R-operation to a nest of subdiagrams, we must, after each successive R-operation, break up the sum of Taylor terms generated for the smaller subdiagrams, and recalculate the new degree of divergence for the next largest subdiagram separately for each term. (If we do not do this, then for a nest of n tripeds, all of which share a common leg, we can generate a counterterm with three gauge fields and $(n+1)$ derivatives.)

Now let V and H be partitions as in Theorems 1 and 2, and let F be any member of $\mathcal{G}(V,H)$, or in other words, let F be any wood of V such that every member of F is $(V\cup H)$-connected.

And for each member (i,A) of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{I}(F,H)))$, or in other words, for each ordered pair (i,A) of a member i of $\mathcal{O}(F,H)=\mathcal{O}(V,H)$, and a member A of $\mathbb{Y}(F,\mathcal{C}(F,i),\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i))$, let n_{iA} be the number of derivatives, in a given BPHZ term, that are produced by the R-operation for A and act on the position argument associated with the member i of $\mathcal{U}(V)$.

Then the most direct application of our rule just stated would would restrict the n_{iA} for a given member A of $\mathbb{B}(F)$, when we do the R-operation for A, by the following *Rule 1*:

Rule 1

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}(A,H)} n_{iA} \leq D_A - \sum_{B\in(\mathcal{P}(F,A)\vdash V)} \left(D_B - \sum_{(i,C)\in(\mathbb{I}_B(F,H)\vdash\mathbb{I}_A(F,H))} n_{iC} \right),$$

since the right-hand side of this inequality is the new degree of divergence of A, for the particular BPHZ Taylor terms for the members C of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ such that $C\subset A$ holds, that are defined by the integers $n_{iC}\geq 0$ that occur in the right-hand side of this inequality, calculated after having carried out the R-operations (and the corresponding subdiagram contractions) for all the members C of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ such that $C\subset A$ holds.

Now if we add to both sides of the above Rule 1 inequality the expression

$$\left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}(A,H)}\ \sum_{C\in\mathbb{Y}(F,\mathcal{C}(V,i),\mathcal{K}(F,A,i))} n_{iC}\right) = \sum_{B\in(\mathcal{P}(F,A)\vdash V)} \left(\sum_{i\in(\mathcal{T}(A,H)\cap B)}\ \sum_{C\in\mathbb{Y}(F,\mathcal{C}(V,i),B)} n_{iC}\right) =$$

$$= \left(\sum_{B\in(\mathcal{P}(F,A)\vdash V)}\ \sum_{(i,C)\in(\mathbb{I}_A(F,H)\cap\mathbb{I}_B(F,H))} n_{iC}\right),$$

(c.f. page 119), we find that the above Rule 1 inequality is equivalent to

$$\sum_{(i,C)\in\mathbb{I}_A(F,H)} n_{iC} \leq D_A - \sum_{B\in(\mathcal{P}(F,A)\vdash V)} \left(D_B - \sum_{(i,C)\in\mathbb{I}_B(F,H)} n_{iC} \right).$$

However it is *not* necessary to use a rule for the Taylor degrees *quite* as restrictive as Rule 1 in order to avoid unwanted counterterms, and we choose *not* to use Rule 1, but rather to use the following *Rule 2*:

Rule 2

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}(A,H)} n_{iA} \leq D_A - \left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}(A,H)} \; \sum_{C\in\mathbb{Y}(F,\mathcal{C}(V,i),\mathcal{K}(F,A,i))} n_{iC}\right).$$

Now if we add to both sides of this Rule 2 inequality the same expression as before, we find that this Rule 2 inequality is equivalent to

$$\sum_{(i,C)\in\mathbb{I}_A(F,H)} n_{iC} \leq D_A.$$

Now $\sum\limits_{(i,C)\in\mathbb{I}_A(F,H)} n_{iC}$ is equal to the total number of derivatives, acting on the fields in the counterterm for A, that are produced by the R-operations for all the members B of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ such that $B \subseteq A$ holds. Hence Rule 2 is precisely equivalent to requiring that the *total* number of derivatives acting on the fields in the counterterm for A, or in other words, the total number of derivatives acting on the fields in the counterterm for A that are produced by the R-operations for all the members B of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ such that $B \subseteq A$ holds, *plus* the total number of derivatives that act out of vertices of A onto the legs of A, (or more generally, onto the external function of A), in the *unrenormalized* Feynman diagram, be $\leq D_A$ plus the total number of derivatives that act out of vertices of A onto the legs of A, (or, more generally, onto the external function of A), in the unrenormalized Feynman diagram.

Now for QCD with $d = 4$, and bearing in mind our rule that before determining the degree of divergence of any subdiagram of the unrenormalized Feynman diagram, we break up the integrand for the diagram into the sum of a finite number of terms, in each of which, every derivative acting out of a vertex acts on a *specific* line or other factor, (such as an external field), and we consider each such term *separately,* the degree of divergence D_A of any connected subdiagram A of the unrenormalized Feynman diagram, such that A contains at least two vertices of the unrenormalized Feynman diagram, (or in other words, such that A is a member of $(\Xi(V) \vdash V) = \mathbb{B}(\Xi(V))$), is equal to 4 minus (the number of gluon legs of A plus $\frac{3}{2}$ times the number of quark legs of A plus the number of derivatives that act out of vertices of A onto legs of A, or more generally onto the external function of A). Hence, bearing in mind that our rules also ensure that there is *no* counterterm for any subdiagram A such that $D_A < 0$ holds, (for there are then *no* acceptable integers $n_{iA} \geq 0$), we find, for QCD with $d = 4$, that Rule 2 is precisely equivalent to allowing all BPHZ Taylor terms consistent with the requirement that in the counterterm for A, the total number of gluon fields plus $\frac{3}{2}$ times quark fields plus derivatives be ≤ 4.

We note that, as is well known, the above formula for D_A for QCD with $d = 4$ arises since each internal gluon line contributes $+2$ to D_A, each internal quark line contributes $+3$ to D_A, and each vertex of A contributes, in the form of derivatives, 4 minus (the number of gluon legs of that vertex plus $\frac{3}{2}$ times the number of quark legs of that vertex plus the number of derivatives that act out of that vertex onto the legs of A, or more generally, onto the external function of A). And furthermore, twice the number of internal gluon lines of A is equal to the total number of gluon legs of the vertices of A, minus the number of external gluon legs of A, and twice the number of internal quark lines of A is equal to the total number of quark legs of the vertices of A, minus the number of external quark legs of A. Hence the total of the contributions to D_A listed so far, which corresponds to the total contribution from the map θ in the notation of Theorem 1, and to the total contribution from the maps θ and g in the notation of Theorem 2, is equal to (4 times the number of vertices of A) minus (the number of gluon legs of A plus $\frac{3}{2}$ times the number of quark legs of A plus the number of derivatives acting from vertices of A onto the legs of A, or more generally, onto the external function of A). Hence when we add the remaining contribution, namely -4 times (one less than the number of vertices of A), we obtain the stated result.

We note that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ such that $D_A \geq 0$ holds and such that there exists a member B of $\mathcal{P}(F, A)$ such that B is a member of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ and $D_B \geq 1$ holds, then Rule 2 allows terms with $n_{iC} = 0$ for all members (i, C) of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{I}(F, H)))$ such that $C \subset A$ holds, and $\displaystyle\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(A,H)} n_{iA} = D_A$, which are forbidden by Rule 1.

We now recall from page 73 that for any ordered pair (M, θ) of a map M such that $\mathcal{D}(M)$ is finite, and every member of $\mathcal{R}(M)$ is a finite set, and a map θ such that $\mathcal{D}(M) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\theta)$ holds, and $\mathcal{R}(\theta)$ is a subset of the set $\mathbb{Z}$ of all the integers, we define $\mathbb{X}(M, \theta)$ to be the set whose members are all the maps p such that $\mathcal{D}(p) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(M))$ holds, $\mathcal{R}(p) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ holds, and for every member A of $\mathcal{D}(M)$, $\sum_{\alpha \in M_A} p_\alpha \leq \theta_A$ holds.

And we note that this definition has the immediate consequence that if, for any member A of $\mathcal{D}(M)$, $\theta_A < 0$ holds, then $\mathbb{X}(M, \theta)$ is the empty set, since there is no map p with the required properties.

Thus $\mathbb{X}(\mathbb{I}(F, H), D)$, where D is the map whose domain is $(\Xi(V) \vdash V)$, and such that for each member A of $(\Xi(V) \vdash V)$, D_A is the degree of divergence of A as defined above, is the set whose members are all the maps n such that $\mathcal{D}(n) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{I}(F, H)))$ holds, (or in other words, such that $\mathcal{D}(n)$ is the set of all the ordered pairs (i, B) of a member i of $\mathcal{O}(F, H) = \mathcal{O}(V, H)$, and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}(F, \mathcal{C}(F, i), \mathcal{Z}(F, H, i))$), $\mathcal{R}(n) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ holds, and for every member A of $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{I}(F, H))$, or in other words, for every member A of $\mathbb{B}(F) = (F \vdash V)$, $\sum_{(i,B) \in \mathbb{I}_A(F,H)} n_{iB} \leq D_A$ holds.

We complete the definition of our R-operation by specifying that, when we do the R-operation for a member A of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ such that there exist one or more members B of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ such that $B \subset A$ holds, (so that, by the rule for sequencing R-operations, the R-operations for those members B of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ will have been done *before* we do the R-operation for A), any Taylor numerator factors, such as $\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(F,B,i)} - x_B\right)$, produced by the R-operations for members B of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ such that $B \subset A$ holds, are to be taken as part of the *internal* function for A when we do the R-operation for A, so they do *not* get affected or operated on when we do the R-operation for A.

Finally we note that the R-operation for each member A of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ introduces a factor of -1, resulting in an overall factor of $(-1)^{\#(\mathbb{B}(F))}$.

We may now confirm by induction that, in the notation of Theorem 1, the result of all the R-operations for the member F of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$, is

$$(-1)^{\#(\mathbb{B}(F))} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{X}(\mathbb{I}(F,H),D)} \left(\left(\prod_{(i,B) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{I}(F,H)))} \left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(F,B,i)} - x_B\right) . \hat{y}_i\right)^{n_{iB}}}{n_{iB}!} \right) \right) \mathcal{J}_F(y) \right)_{y = \eta(F,H,x)} .$$

We first note that the rule for sequencing the R-operations for the members of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ is that, if A and B are any members of $\mathbb{B}(F)$ such that $B \subset A$ holds, then we must do the R-operation for B *before* we do the R-operation for A.

Now our result is certainly true when F is equal to V, (or in other words, when $\mathbb{B}(F)$ is empty), hence it will be sufficient to prove that if F is any member of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$, and A is any $(V \cup H)$-connected member of $(\Xi(V) \vdash V)$ such that if B is any member of F, then B is either a *strict* subset of A, or else $B \cap A$ is empty, then our result is true for $F \cup \{A\}$ if it is true for F.

Let F be any member of $\mathcal{G}(V, H)$, and let A be any $(V \cup H)$-connected member of

$(\Xi(V) \vdash V)$ such that if B is any member of F, then B is either a *strict* subset of A, or else $B \cap A$ is empty, and assume that our result is true for F.

We first note that when we replace any internal propagators of A, that are *not* internal propagators of any member of F, by modified propagators as described on pages 225 to 226, (making the replacements *inside* the y-derivatives), the result is the replacement of $\mathcal{J}_F(y)$ by $\mathcal{J}_{(F \cup \{A\})}(y)$, defined in accordance with page 226.

We next note that if B is any member of $\mathbb{B}(F)$, and i is any member of B, then $\mathcal{K}(F, B, i)$ is equal $\mathcal{K}((F \cup \{A\}), B, i)$.

Now let i be any member of $\mathcal{T}(A, H)$. Then $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$, which by definition is the largest member of F to have i as a member but not contain as a subset any member of H that has i as a member, is equal to $\mathcal{K}((F \cup \{A\}), A, i)$, and $\mathcal{Z}((F \cup \{A\}), H, i)$ is equal to A. Hence $\left(x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}((F \cup \{A\}),H,i)}\right)$ is equal to $\left(x_{\mathcal{K}((F \cup \{A\}),A,i)} - x_A\right)$.

Furthermore, if i is any member of $\mathcal{O}(F, H) = \mathcal{O}(V, H)$ such that i is *not* a member of $\mathcal{T}(A, H)$, then $\mathcal{Z}((F \cup \{A\}), H, i)$ is equal to $\mathcal{Z}(F, H, i)$, and furthermore, for *every* member i of $\mathcal{U}(V)$, $\mathcal{C}((F \cup \{A\}), i) = \mathcal{C}(F, i) = \mathcal{C}(V, i)$ holds.

Hence, by the definition of $\eta(F, H, x)$ on page 89 and on page 230, $\eta_i((F \cup \{A\}), H, x) = \eta_i(F, H, x)$ holds for every member i of $\mathcal{U}(V)$ such that i is *not* a member of $\mathcal{T}(A, H)$, while if i *is* a member of $\mathcal{T}(A, H)$, then $\eta_i((F \cup \{A\}), H, x) = x_A$ holds.

We next note that by our rule stated on page 233, all Taylor numerators $\left(x_{\mathcal{K}(F,B,i)} - x_B\right)$ coming from the R-operations for members B of F such that $B \subset A$ holds, are to be included in the *internal* function for A when we do the R-operation for A, hence are *unaffected* by the R-operation for A, (other than re-writing $\mathcal{K}(F, B, i)$ as $\mathcal{K}((F \cup \{A\}), B, i)$ by the identity noted above).

This means that for each individual Taylor term produced by the R-operation for A, (where each derivative associated with A in that term, acts on the position variable associated with a *specific* member i of $\mathcal{T}(A, H)$), we may realize the differentiations by *restoring* the independent y_i variables for all the members i of $\mathcal{U}(V)$, (which we may do unambiguously since it simply corresponds to allowing all the $\#(\mathcal{U}(V))$ position-arguments of $\mathcal{J}_{(F \cup \{A\})}(y)$ to be independent variables again), then acting with the differential operator

$$\left(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{T}(A,H)} \left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i)} - x_{\mathcal{Z}((F \cup \{A\}),H,i)}\right) . \hat{y}_i\right)^{n_{iA}}}{n_{iA}!}\right)\right) =$$

$$= \left(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{T}(A,H)} \left(\frac{\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}((F\cup\{A\}),A,i)} - x_A \right) . \hat{y}_i \right)^{n_{iA}}}{n_{iA}!} \right) \right),$$

where the integers $n_{iA} \geq 0$, $i \in \mathcal{T}(A,H)$, define the specific Taylor term for A which we are considering, then *evaluating* the y_i variables, $i \in \mathcal{U}(V)$, by $y_i = \eta_i((F \cup \{A\}), H, x)$ for all members i of $\mathcal{U}(V)$, or in other words, $y = \eta((F \cup \{A\}), H, x)$.

We next note that $\mathbb{I}((F \cup \{A\}), H)$ is the map whose domain is $\mathbb{B}(F \cup \{A\}) = \mathbb{B}(F) \cup \{A\}$, and such that for each member C of $\mathbb{B}(F) \cup \{A\}$, $\mathbb{I}_C((F \cup \{A\}), H)$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (i, B) of a member i of $\mathcal{T}(C, H)$ and a member B of $\mathbb{Y}((F \cup \{A\}), \mathcal{C}(V, i), C)$. Hence for every member C of $\mathbb{B}(F)$, $\mathbb{I}_C((F \cup \{A\}), H)$ is equal to $\mathbb{I}_C(F, H)$.

And furthermore, $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{I}((F \cup \{A\}), H)))$ is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (i, B) of a member i of $\mathcal{O}(V, H)$ and member B of $\mathbb{Y}((F \cup \{A\}), \mathcal{C}(V, i), \mathcal{Z}((F \cup \{A\}), H, i))$, hence $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{I}((F \cup \{A\}), H)))$ is equal to the disjoint union of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{I}(F, H)))$ and the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (i, A), $i \in \mathcal{T}(A, H)$.

Now by our induction assumption, the integers $n_{iC} \geq 0$, $(i, C) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{I}(F, H)))$, are to be summed over the set $\mathbb{X}(\mathbb{I}(F, H), D)$, which is the set whose members are all the maps n such that $\mathcal{D}(n)$ is equal to $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{I}(F, H)))$, $\mathcal{R}(n) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ holds, and for every member C of $\mathbb{B}(F)$, $\sum_{(i,B) \in \mathbb{I}_C(F,H)} n_{iB} \leq D_C$ holds, and by our fundamental rule, stated on page 230, when we do the R-operation for A, we are to break up the sum of Taylor terms resulting from previous R-operations into a sum of terms in each of which every derivative resulting from previous R-operations acts on the position variable associated with a *specific* member i of $\mathcal{U}(V)$, and determine the summation range of the integers $n_{iA} \geq 0$, $i \in \mathcal{T}(A, H)$, *separately* for each such term, or in other words, *separately* for each member n of $\mathbb{X}(\mathbb{I}(F, H), D)$, and furthermore, as stated on page 231, we choose to determine the summation range of the $n_{iA} \geq 0$, $i \in \mathcal{T}(A, H)$, by *Rule 2* as stated on page 232, (where we must replace the F in the Rule 2 inequality by $(F \cup \{A\})$ in the present case).

This means that after performing the R-operation for A we have a double summation, where the *inner* summation, to be performed *first*, is over the $n_{iA} \geq 0$, $i \in \mathcal{T}(A, H)$, subject to the Rule 2 inequality as stated on page 232, with the F of that inequality replaced by $(F \cup \{A\})$, and the *outer* summation, to be performed *second*, is over the members n of $\mathbb{X}(\mathbb{I}(F, H), D)$.

Thus we may now complete the proof of the induction step by the use of Lemma 17, with the map V of Lemma 17 taken as our present map $\mathbb{I}\left(\left(F \cup \{A\}\right), H\right)$, the set J of Lemma 17 taken as the subset $\mathbb{B}\left(F\right)$ of $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{I}\left(\left(F \cup \{A\}\right), H\right)\right)$, (so that the set $\downarrow\!(V, J)$ of Lemma 17 is our present map $\mathbb{I}\left(F, H\right)$), the set K of Lemma 17 taken as the one-member set $\{A\}$, the map W of Lemma 17 taken as the map whose domain is the one-member set $\{A\}$, and such that W_A is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (i, B) of a member i of $\mathcal{T}\left(A, H\right)$, and a member B of $\left(\mathbb{Y}\left(\left(F \cup \{A\}\right), \mathcal{C}\left(V, i\right), A\right) \vdash \mathbb{Y}\left(F, \mathcal{C}\left(V, i\right), \mathcal{Z}\left(F, H, i\right)\right)\right) = \{A\}$, (hence W_A is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (i, A), $i \in \mathcal{T}\left(A, H\right)$), the map θ of Lemma 17 taken as our present map D, and for each member u of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{I}(F,H)))}$, the map $\zeta\left(u\right)$ of Lemma 17 taken as the map whose domain is the one-member set $\{A\}$, and such that

$$\zeta_A\left(u\right) \equiv \sum_{(i,B)\in(\mathbb{I}_A((F\cup\{A\}),H)\cap\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{I}(F,H))))} =$$

$$= \left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}(A,H)} \sum_{B\in\mathbb{Y}(F,\mathcal{C}(V,i),\mathcal{Z}(F,H,i))} u_{iB}\right) =$$

$$= \left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}(A,H)} \sum_{B\in\mathbb{Y}((F\cup\{A\}),\mathcal{C}(V,i),\mathcal{K}((F\cup\{A\}),A,i))} u_{iB}\right)$$

holds, and the map Y of Lemma 17 taken as the map whose domain is equal to $\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\mathbb{I}\left(\left(F \cup \{A\}\right), H\right)\right)\right)$, or in other words, whose domain is equal to the disjoint union of $\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\mathbb{I}\left(F, H\right)\right)\right)$ and the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (i, A), $i \in \mathcal{T}\left(A, H\right)$, and such that for each member (i, B) of $\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(\mathbb{I}\left(\left(F \cup \{A\}\right), H\right)\right)\right)$, Y_{iB} is equal to the differential operator $\left(\left(x_{\mathcal{K}((F\cup\{A\}),B,i)} - x_B\right).\hat{y}_i\right)$.

We note that when we make these choices for the sets that occur in Lemma 17, the set $\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(W\right)\right)$ of Lemma 17 is the set whose members are all the ordered pairs (i, A), $i \in \mathcal{T}\left(A, H\right)$, and the set $\mathbb{X}\left(W, \left(\theta - \zeta\left(u\right)\right)\right)$ of Lemma 17, where u is any member of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{I}(F,H)))}$, is the set whose members are all the maps v such that $\mathcal{D}\left(v\right)$ is the set $\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{R}\left(W\right)\right)$ of all the ordered pairs (i, A), $i \in \mathcal{T}\left(A, H\right)$, $\mathcal{R}\left(v\right) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ holds, and the Rule 2 inequality holds for A in the form

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}(A,H)} v_{iA} \leq D_A - \left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}(A,H)} \sum_{B\in\mathbb{Y}((F\cup\{A\}),\mathcal{C}(V,i),\mathcal{K}((F\cup\{A\}),A,i))} u_{iB}\right).$$

We note that, as is well known, if a and b are any members of $\mathbb{R}$ such that $a < b$ holds, then thre exist members f of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $f(r)$ is equal to 1 for all members r of $\mathbb{R}$ such that $r \leq a$ holds, $f(r)$ is equal to 0 for all members r of $\mathbb{R}$ such that $r \geq b$ holds, and f is infinitely differentiable with respect to r for *all* members r of $\mathbb{R}$. For example, a possible form of $f(r)$ for $a \leq r \leq b$, is $f(r) = \dfrac{1}{1 + e^{\frac{-1}{r-a}} e^{\frac{1}{b-r}}}$. (We note that if we choose $f(r)$ for $a \leq r \leq b$ as in this example, then the identity $f(r) + f(a + b - r) = 1$ holds for *all* $r \in \mathbb{R}$.)

Then for $\mathcal{J}_F(y)$, $F \in \mathcal{G}(V, H)$, defined as on page 226, we may construct sequences $\mathcal{J}_{kF}(y)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfying the requirements of Theorem 2, by replacing the propagators $G_{Aij}(y_i, y_j)$ by sequences $G_{kAij}(y_i, y_j)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, of regularized propagators, which may be obtained from the propagators $G_{Aij}(y_i, y_j)$ either by convoluting these propagators with a sequence of normalized, spherically symmetric smearing functions, differentiable at least N times, where N is the integer defined on page 166, and which vanish identically outside a sequence of radii b_k which tend to 0 as k tends to ∞, or else simply by *multiplying* these propagators by a sequence $f_k(|y_i - y_j|)$ of functions, each differentiable at least N times, where N is the integer defined on page 166, such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, real numbers a_k and b_k exist such that $0 < a_k < b_k$ holds, $f_k(r) = 0$ holds for all $0 \leq r \leq a_k$, and $f_k(r) = 1$ holds for all $r \geq b_k$, and the sequences a_k and b_k, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, tend to 0 as k tends to ∞.

We observe that we made just three uses of the regularized integrands in Theorem 2.

Firstly we needed the regularization to justify the use, on page 170, of the Taylor remainder result of Lemma 22. For unlike the case of Theorem 1, where the good set of woods conditions and Lemma 14 ensured that no propagator affected by the Taylor remainder had its arguments coinciding for any $\rho \in \mathbb{D}$, in Theorem 2 it *is* possible for the arguments of a *key* propagator of a member of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ to coincide for some $\rho \in \mathbb{D}$, so we need the regularization to justify the use of Taylor remainder in this instance. (We separated the analysis of the convergence of the integrals associated with the key propagators of the members of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, from the analysis of the convergence of the integrals associated with the firm components of the members of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, by transforming to the a_K integration variables as defined on pages 184 and 185.)

Secondly we used the regularizations on page 171 to justify swapping the order of the ρ-integrations and the x-integrations, to enable us to do the x-integrals before doing the ρ-integrals.

And thirdly we used the regularizations on pages 188 and 189 to obtain the integration-by-parts result stated on those pages.

We did not at any stage need the actual evaluation of any regularized integral, and furthermore, as demonstrated on pages 197 to 220, our integrals, after carrying out all the integrations by parts, as done on pages 186 to 197, to remove all the derivatives from all the *key* propagators of the members of $\mathbb{B}(G)$, are *absolutely* convergent.

Thus in practical calculations it may be possible to proceed without introducing any explicit regularization, allowing the use of Taylor remainder, swapping the order of the ρ-integrations and the x-integrations, and integrating by parts as above, *as if* our integrand was regularized, provided that we strictly restrict our use of such manipulations to the manner in which they are used in our proof of Theorem 2, where they are justified by the introduction of regularizations. This would be analogous to the possibility of carrying out a certain strictly limited class of manipulations with the Dirac δ-function, without the necessity of defining it formally, via sequences of functions, as a generalized function.

Finally we note that the crucial properties of the set $\Omega(H,\sigma,R,x)$, defined on page 37, that enable us to prove Theorem 1, are Lemma 7, which with Lemma 8 makes possible the definition of good sets of woods, Lemma 10, which gives lower bounds, used on page 122, on $\mathbb{L}(P,A,x)$ for the members A of $\mathbb{B}(P)$ if (P,Q) generates a good set of woods for (H,σ,R,x), and Lemma 11, used on page 131, which ensures that if A is any member of $\mathbb{B}\left(\bar{P}\right)$ and X is any σ-cluster of $\downarrow(x,\mathcal{P}(P,A))$, then $(V\cup H)$-connected components of $\mathcal{U}(X)$ will under appropriate conditions be members of $(Q\vdash P)$.

There may be alternative definitions of $\Omega(H,\sigma,R,x)$, *not* equivalent to that given on page 37, which nevertheless allow analogues of these three properties to be derived. One example of an alternative definition, which may possibly be adequate, would say that a member (P,Q) of $\mathcal{N}(V,H)$ is a member of $\Omega(H,\sigma,R,x)$ ifif $\mathbb{L}(Q,A,x)<R$ holds for all $A\in(Q\vdash P)$, and for all $\{i,j\}\in W$ such that $\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i)\in(Q\vdash P)$ holds, there exists a member B of P such that $B\subseteq\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,j)$ holds, there is *no* member C of P such that $B\subset C\subseteq\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,j)$ holds, and $\mathbb{L}(Q,\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i),x)<\sigma\left|x_{\mathcal{Z}(Q,H,i)}-x_B\right|$ holds.

References

[1] N. N. Bogoliubov and O. S. Parasiuk, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, **100** (1955) 25-28, 429-432.

[2] N. N. Bogoliubov and O. S. Parasiuk, "On The Multiplication Of The Causal Function In The Quantum Theory Of Fields," Acta Math. **97** (1957) 227-266.

[3] N. N. Bogoliubov and D. V. Shirkov, "Introduction To The Theory Of Quantized Fields," Intersci. Monogr. Phys. Astron. **3** (1959) 1-720.

[4] F. J. Dyson, "The Radiation Theories Of Tomonaga, Schwinger, And Feynman," Phys. Rev. **75** (1949) 486-502.

[5] F. J. Dyson, "The S Matrix In Quantum Electrodynamics," Phys. Rev. **75** (1949) 1736-1755.

[6] A. Salam, "Overlapping Divergences And The S Matrix," Phys. Rev. **82** (1951) 217-227.

[7] A. Salam, "Divergent Integrals In Renormalizable Field Theories," Phys. Rev. **84** (1951) 426-431.

[8] K. Hepp, "Proof Of The Bogoliubov-Parasiuk Theorem On Renormalization," Commun. Math. Phys. **2** (1966) 301-326. Available online at: `http://projecteuclid.org/Dienst/UI/1.0/Summarize/euclid.cmp/1103815087?abstract=`

[9] S. Weinberg, "High-Energy Behavior In Quantum Field Theory," Phys. Rev. **118** (1960) 838-849.

[10] Y. Hahn and W. Zimmermann, "An elementary proof of Dyson's power counting theorem," Commun. Math. Phys. **10** (1968) 330-342. Available online at: `http://projecteuclid.org/Dienst/UI/1.0/Summarize/euclid.cmp/1103841121?abstract=`

[11] W. Zimmermann, "The power counting theorem for Minkowski metric," Commun. Math. Phys. **11** (1968) 1-8. Available online at: `http://projecteuclid.org/Dienst/UI/1.0/Summarize/euclid.cmp/1103841149?abstract=`

[12] W. Zimmermann, "Convergence of Bogoliubov's Method of Renormalization in Momentum Space," Commun. Math. Phys. **15** (1969) 208-234. Reprinted in Lect. Notes Phys. **558** (2000) 217-243. Available online at:
`http://projecteuclid.org/Dienst/UI/1.0/Summarize/euclid.cmp/1103841945?abstract=`

[13] C. Austin, "Cluster Convergence Theorem," hep-th/0509033.

[14] C. Austin, "Group-variation equations for the coefficients in the $1/N$ expansions of physical quantities in SU(N) gauge theories in $D = 3 + 1$," hep-th/0102107.

[15] C. Austin, "A brief summary of the group-variation equations," hep-th/0104248.

[16] G. 't Hooft, "Rigorous Construction of Planar Diagram Field Theories in Four Dimensional Euclidean Space," Commun. Math. Phys. **88** (1983) 1-25. Available online at:
`http://projecteuclid.org/Dienst/UI/1.0/Summarize/euclid.cmp/1103922211?abstract=`

[17] K. G. Chetyrkin, A. L. Kataev and F. V. Tkachov, "New Approach To Evaluation Of Multiloop Feynman Integrals: The Gegenbauer Polynomial X Space Technique," Nucl. Phys. B **174** (1980) 345-377.

[18] J. H. Lowenstein, "Auxiliary Mass Formulation Of The Pure Yang-Mills Model," Nucl. Phys. **B96** (1975) 189-208.

[19] J. H. Lowenstein, "BPHZ Renormalization," NYU-TR11-75, 66pp. Lectures given at Int. School of Mathematical Physics, Erice, Sicily, Aug 17-31, 1975. Published in *Renormalization Theory*, eds. G. Velo and A. S. Wightman, Proceedings of the NATO ASI, Erice Math. Phys. (1975) 95.

[20] J. H. Lowenstein and W. Zimmermann, "The Power Counting Theorem For Feynman Integrals With Massless Propagators," Commun. Math. Phys. **44** (1975) 73-86, reprinted in Lect. Notes Phys. **558** (2000) 310-323. Available online at:
`http://projecteuclid.org/Dienst/UI/1.0/Summarize/euclid.cmp/1103899254?abstract=`

[21] J. H. Lowenstein, "Convergence Theorems For Renormalized Feynman Integrals With Zero - Mass Propagators," Commun. Math. Phys. **47** (1976) 53-68. Available

online at:
`http://projecteuclid.org/Dienst/UI/1.0/Summarize/euclid.cmp/1103899686?abstract=`

[22] A. Quadri, “Slavnov-Taylor parameterization of Yang-Mills theory with massive fermions in the presence of singlet axial-vector currents,” JHEP **0506** (2005) 068, hep-th/0504076.

[23] A. Slavnov, Kiev Report No. ITP-71-83E (unpublished).

[24] A. A. Slavnov, “Ward Identities In Gauge Theories,” Theor. Math. Phys. **10** (1972) 99-107 [Teor. Mat. Fiz. **10** (1972) 153-161], also in Lai, C. H. (ed.): “Gauge Theory Of Weak and Electromagnetic Interactions,” 264-272.

[25] J. C. Taylor, “Ward Identities And Charge Renormalization Of The Yang-Mills Field,” Nucl. Phys. **B33** (1971) 436-444.

[26] C. Becchi, A. Rouet, and R. Stora, “The Abelian Higgs-Kibble model. Unitarity of the S operator,” Phys. Lett. **B52** (1974) 344-346.

[27] I. V. Tyutin, “Gauge invariance in field theory and statistical physics in operator formalism,” LEBEDEV-75-39.

[28] R. P. Feynman, “Quantum Theory Of Gravitation,” Acta Phys. Polon. **24** (1963) 697-722.

[29] B. S. DeWitt, “Quantum Theory Of Gravity. II. The Manifestly Covariant Theory,” Phys. Rev. **162** (1967) 1195-1239.

[30] L. D. Faddeev and V. N. Popov, “Feynman Diagrams For The Yang-Mills Field,” Phys. Lett. **B25** (1967) 29-30.

[31] G. ’t Hooft, “Renormalization Of Massless Yang-Mills Fields,” Nucl. Phys. **B33** (1971) 173-199.

[32] R. Mills, “Propagator Gauge Transformations for Non-Abelian Gauge Fields,” Phys. Rev. **D3** (1971) 2969-2977.

[33] G. Sterman, P. K. Townsend, and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, “Unitarity, Ward identities, and new quantization rules of supergravity,” Phys. Rev. **D17** (1978) 1501-1514.

[34] J. C. Ward, "An Identity In Quantum Electrodynamics," Phys. Rev. **78** (1950) 182.

[35] Y. Takahashi, "On The Generalized Ward Identity," Nuovo Cimento **6** (1957) 371.

[36] J. Steinberger, "On the use of subtraction fields and the lifetimes of some types of meson decay," Phys. Rev. **76** (1949) 1180-1186.

[37] S. Fukuda and Y. Miyamoto, "On the γ-decay of neutral meson," Prog. Theor. Phys. **4** (1949) 235(L) and 347.

[38] S. L. Adler, "Axial vector vertex in Spinor Electrodynamics," Phys. Rev. **177** (1969) 2426-2438.

[39] J. S. Bell and R. Jackiw, "A PCAC Puzzle: $\pi^0 \to \gamma\gamma$ in the Sigma Model," Nuovo Cim. **A60** (1969) 47-61.

[40] S. L. Adler and W. A. Bardeen, "Absence of Higher Order Corrections in the Anomalous Axial Vector Divergence Equation," Phys. Rev. **182** (1969) 1517-1536.

[41] D. J. Gross and R. Jackiw, "Effect of Anomalies on Quasirenormalizable Theories," Phys. Rev. **D6** (1972) 477-493.

[42] K. Fujikawa, "On the Evaluation of Chiral Anomaly in Gauge Theories with γ^5 Couplings," Phys. Rev. **D29** (1984) 285-292.

[43] L. Alvarez-Gaumé and E. Witten, "Gravitational Anomalies," Nucl. Phys. **B234** (1984) 269-330.

[44] M. F. Atiyah and I. M. Singer, "Dirac Operators Coupled To Vector Potentials," Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **81** (1984) 2597-2600.

[45] B. Zumino, "Chiral Anomalies And Differential Geometry: Lectures Given At Les Houches, August 1983," published in *Relativity, Groups, and Topology II* (Les Houches Lectures 1983), B. S. DeWitt and R. Stora eds., North Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.

[46] R. Stora, "Algebraic Structure And Topological Origin Of Anomalies," LAPP-TH-94, Seminar given at Cargese Summer Inst., Cargese, France, Sep 1-15, 1983. Published in Cargese Summer Inst. 1983: *Progress in Gauge Field Theory.*

[47] M. B. Green and J. H. Schwarz, "Anomaly Cancellation In Supersymmetric $D = 10$ Gauge Theory And Superstring Theory," Phys. Lett. **B149** (1984) 117-122.

[48] M. B. Green and J. H. Schwarz, "The Hexagon Gauge Anomaly In Type I Superstring Theory," Nucl. Phys. **B255** (1985) 93-114, reprinted in Schwarz, J.H. (ed.): *Superstrings,* Vol. 2, 1018-1039.

[49] L. Alvarez-Gaumé and P. H. Ginsparg, "The Topological Meaning of Nonabelian Anomalies," Nucl. Phys. **B243** (1984) 449-474.

[50] L. Alvarez-Gaumé and P. H. Ginsparg, "The Structure of Gauge and Gravitational Anomalies," Annals Phys. **161** (1985) 423-490, Erratum-ibid **171** (1986) 233.

[51] C. G. Callan and J. A. Harvey, "Anomalies And Fermion Zero Modes On Strings And Domain Walls," Nucl. Phys. **B250** (1985) 427-436.

[52] H. Itoyama, V. P. Nair and H.-c. Ren, "Supersymmetry Anomalies And Some Aspects Of Renormalization," Nucl. Phys. **B262** (1985) 317-330.

[53] H. Itoyama, V. P. Nair and H.-c. Ren, "Supersymmetry Anomalies: Further Results," Phys. Lett. **B168** (1986) 78-82.

[54] G. Grignani, "Supersymmetry anomaly in ten dimensions," Phys. Rev. **D38** (1988) 1859-1862.

[55] A. W. Fisher, "Consistency Condition Calculations Of Supersymmetry Anomalies," Nucl. Phys. **B297** (1988) 315-337.

[56] J. A. Harvey, "TASI 2003 Lectures on Anomalies," hep-th/0509097.

[57] J. Wess and B. Zumino, "Consequences Of Anomalous Ward Identities," Phys. Lett. **B37** (1971) 95-97.

[58] L. Baulieu, "Perturbative Gauge Theories," Phys. Rept. **129** (1985) 1-74.

[59] F. Brandt, N. Dragon, and M. Kreuzer, "Completeness And Nontriviality Of The Solutions Of The Consistency Conditions," Nucl. Phys. **B332** (1990) 224-249.

[60] F. Brandt, "Antifield dependence of anomalies," Phys. Lett. B **320** (1994) 57-63, hep-th/9310080.

[61] M. Dubois-Violette, M. Henneaux, M. Talon, and C.-M. Viallet, "General solution of the consistency equation," Phys. Lett. **B289** (1992) 361-367, hep-th/9206106.

[62] G. Barnich and M. Henneaux, "Renormalization of gauge invariant operators and anomalies in Yang-Mills theory," Phys. Rev. Lett. **72** (1994) 1588-1591, hep-th/9312206.

[63] G. Barnich, F. Brandt, and M. Henneaux, "Local BRST cohomology in the antifield formalism. 2. Application to Yang-Mills theory," Commun. Math. Phys. **174** (1995) 93-116, hep-th/9405194.

[64] G. Barnich, F. Brandt, and M. Henneaux, "General solution of the Wess-Zumino consistency condition for Einstein gravity," Phys. Rev. **D51** (1995) 1435-1439, hep-th/9409104.

[65] G. Barnich, F. Brandt, and M. Henneaux, "Local BRST cohomology in Einstein-Yang-Mills theory," Nucl. Phys. **B455** (1995) 357-408, hep-th/9505173.

[66] F. Brandt, "Local BRST Cohomology in Minimal $D = 4$, $N = 1$ Supergravity," Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **259** (1997) 253-312, hep-th/9609192.

[67] M. Henneaux, B. Knaepen, and C. Schomblond, "BRST cohomology of the Chapline-Manton model," Lett. Math. Phys. **42** (1997) 337-348, hep-th/9702042.

[68] G. Barnich, F. Brandt, and M. Henneaux, "Local BRST cohomology in gauge theories," Phys. Rept. **338** (2000) 439-569, hep-th/0002245.

[69] W. Zimmermann, "Local Operator Products and Renormalization," in *Lectures on Elementary Particles and Quantum Field Theory,* 1970 Brandeis Summer Institute in Theoretical Physics, edited by S. Deser, M. Grisaru, and H. Pendleton, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass. (1971), Vol. I, p. 397.

[70] W. Zimmermann, "Composite Operators In The Perturbation Theory Of Renormalizable Interactions," Annals Phys. **77** (1973) 536-569, reprinted in Lect. Notes Phys. **558** (2000) 244-277.

[71] W. Zimmermann, "Normal Products And The Short Distance Expansion In The Perturbation Theory Of Renormalizable Interactions," Annals Phys. **77** (1973) 570-601, reprinted in Lect. Notes Phys. **558** (2000) 278-309.

[72] J. H. Lowenstein, "Differential Vertex Operations in Lagrangian Field Theory," Commun. Math. Phys. **24** (1971) 1-21. Available online at: `http://projecteuclid.org/Dienst/UI/1.0/Summarize/euclid.cmp/1103857701?abstract=`

[73] J. H. Lowenstein, "Normal-Product Quantization of Currents in Lagrangian Field Theory," Phys. Rev. **D4** (1971) 2281-2290.

[74] Y. M. P. Lam, "Perturbation Lagrangian Theory for Scalar Fields - Ward-Takahashi Identity and Current Algebra," Phys. Rev. **D6** (1972) 2145-2161.

[75] Y. M. P. Lam, "Perturbation Lagrangian Theory for Dirac Fields - Ward-Takahashi Identity and Current Algebra," Phys. Rev. **D6** (1972) 2161-2167.

[76] M. Gomes and J. H. Lowenstein, "Linear Relations Among Normal-Product Fields," Phys. Rev. **D7** (1973) 550-554.

[77] Y. M. P. Lam, "Equivalence Theorem on Bogoliubov-Parasiuk-Hepp-Zimmermann-Renormalized Lagrangian Field Theories," Phys. Rev. **D7** (1973) 2943-2949.

[78] J. L. Rosner, "The Standard Model in 2001," Lectures given at 55th Scottish Universities Summer School in Physics: Heavy Flavor Physics, St. Andrews, Scotland, 7-23 Aug 2001. Published in *St. Andrews 2001, Heavy flavour physics*, 1-56, hep-ph/0108195.

[79] D. Z. Freedman, P. van Nieuwenhuizen, and S. Ferrara, "Progress Toward A Theory Of Supergravity," Phys. Rev. **D13** (1976) 3214-3218.

[80] S. Deser and B. Zumino, "Consistent Supergravity," Phys. Lett. **B62** (1976) 335-337.

[81] C. Becchi, A. Rouet, and R. Stora, "Renormalization of the Abelian Higgs-Kibble model," Commun. Math. Phys. **42** (1975) 127-162. Available online at: `http://projecteuclid.org/Dienst/UI/1.0/Summarize/euclid.cmp/1103899003?abstract=`

[82] C. Becchi, A. Rouet, and R. Stora, "Renormalization of gauge theories," Annals Phys. **98** (1976) 287-321.

[83] P. W. Higgs, "Broken Symmetries, Massless Particles And Gauge Fields," Phys. Lett. **12** (1964) 132-133.

[84] P. W. Higgs, "Spontaneous Symmetry Breakdown Without Massless Bosons," Phys. Rev. **145** (1966) 1156-1163.

[85] T. W. B. Kibble, "Symmetry Breaking In Non-Abelian Gauge Theories," Phys. Rev. **155** (1967) 1554-1561.

[86] G. 't Hooft, "Renormalizable Lagrangians For Massive Yang-Mills Fields," Nucl. Phys. **B35** (1971) 167-188.

[87] G. 't Hooft and M. Veltman, "Example of a gauge field theory," Proceedings of the Colloquium on Renormalization of Yang-Mills Fields, CNRS Marseille, June 19-23, 1972, CERN/TH 1571.

[88] O. Piguet and S. P. Sorella, "Algebraic renormalization: Perturbative renormalization, symmetries and anomalies," Lect. Notes Phys. **M28** (1995) 1-134.

[89] P. A. Grassi, "Stability and renormalization of Yang-Mills theory with background field method: A Regularization independent proof," Nucl. Phys. **B462** (1996) 524-550, hep-th/9505101.

[90] E. Kraus, "Renormalization of the electroweak standard model to all orders," Annals Phys. **262** (1998) 155-259, hep-th/9709154.

[91] R. Ferrari and P. A. Grassi, "Constructive algebraic renormalization of the Abelian Higgs-Kibble model," Phys. Rev. **D60** (1999) 065010, hep-th/9807191.

[92] C. P. Martin and D. Sanchez-Ruiz, "Action principles, restoration of BRS symmetry and the renormalization group equation for chiral non-Abelian gauge theories in dimensional renormalization with a non-anticommuting γ^5," Nucl. Phys. **B572** (2000) 387-477, hep-th/9905076.

[93] R. Ferrari, P. A. Grassi and A. Quadri, "Direct algebraic restoration of Slavnov-Taylor identities in the Abelian Higgs-Kibble model," Phys. Lett. **B472** (2000) 346-356, hep-th/9905192.

[94] P. A. Grassi, T. Hurth and M. Steinhauser, "Practical algebraic renormalization," Annals Phys. **288** (2001) 197-248, hep-ph/9907426.

[95] P. A. Grassi, “Renormalization of non-semisimple gauge models with the background field method,” Nucl. Phys. **B560** (1999) 499-550, hep-th/9908188.

[96] P. A. Grassi, T. Hurth and M. Steinhauser, “Non-invariant two-loop counterterms for the three-gauge-boson vertices,” JHEP **0011** (2000) 037, hep-ph/0011067.

[97] P. A. Grassi, T. Hurth and M. Steinhauser, “The algebraic method,” Nucl. Phys. **B610** (2001) 215-250, hep-ph/0102005.

[98] A. Quadri, “Slavnov-Taylor parameterization for the quantum restoration of BRST symmetries in anomaly-free gauge theories,” JHEP **0304** (2003) 017, hep-th/0301211.

[99] S. D. Joglekar and B. W. Lee, “General Theory Of Renormalization Of Gauge Invariant Operators,” Annals Phys. (N.Y.) **97** (1976) 160-215.

[100] M. Henneaux, “Remarks on the renormalization of gauge invariant operators in Yang-Mills theory,” Phys. Lett. **B313** (1993) 35-40, Erratum-ibid. **B316** (1993) 633, hep-th/9306101.

[101] G. ’t Hooft and M. J. G. Veltman, “One Loop Divergencies In The Theory Of Gravitation,” Annales Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Theor. **A20** (1974) 69-94.

[102] G. ’t Hooft, “Perturbative quantum gravity,” prepared for International School of Subnuclear Physics: 40th Course: From Quarks and Gluons to Quantum Gravity, Erice, Sicily, Italy, 29 Aug - 7 Sep 2002. Published in Erice 2002, *From quarks and gluons to quantum gravity*, 249-269. Available online at `http://www.phys.uu.nl/~thooft/lectures/erice02.pdf`

[103] D. Z. Freedman and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, “Properties Of Supergravity Theory,” Phys. Rev. **D14** (1976) 912-916.

[104] F. Brandt, “Lectures on supergravity,” Fortsch. Phys. **50** (2002) 1126-1172, hep-th/0204035.

[105] E. Cremmer, B. Julia and J. Scherk, “Supergravity Theory In 11 Dimensions,” Phys. Lett. **B76** (1978) 409-412.

[106] H. Nicolai, P. K. Townsend and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, “Comments On Eleven-Dimensional Supergravity,” Lett. Nuovo Cim. **30** (1981) 315.

[107] A. Sagnotti and T. N. Tomaras, "Properties Of Eleven-Dimensional Supergravity," CALT-68-885. Available online from KEK at `http://ccdb3fs.kek.jp/cgi-bin/img_index?8203146`

[108] S. Naito, K. Osada, and T. Fukui, "Fierz identities and invariance of 11-dimensional supergravity action," Phys. Rev. **D34** (1986) 536-552.

[109] A. Miemiec and I. Schnakenburg, "Basics of M-theory," hep-th/0509137.

[110] B. de Wit, P. van Nieuwenhuizen, and A. Van Proeyen, "Quantization of 11-dimensional supergravity," Phys. Lett. **B104** (1981) 27-30.

[111] K. Bautier, S. Deser, M. Henneaux and D. Seminara, "No cosmological $D = 11$ supergravity," Phys. Lett. **B406** (1997) 49-53, hep-th/9704131.

[112] I. A. Bandos, J. A. de Azcárraga, M. Picón, and O. Varela, "Generalized curvature and the equations of $D = 11$ supergravity," Phys. Lett. **B615** (2005) 127-133, hep-th/0501007.

[113] P. Hořava and E. Witten, "Heterotic And Type I String Dynamics From Eleven Dimensions," Nucl. Phys. **B460** (1996) 506-524, hep-th/9510209.

[114] P. Hořava and E. Witten, "Eleven-Dimensional Supergravity on a Manifold with Boundary," Nucl. Phys. **B475** (1996) 94-114, hep-th/9603142.

[115] E. Witten, "Strong Coupling Expansion Of Calabi-Yau Compactification," Nucl. Phys. **B471** (1996) 135-158, hep-th/9602070.

[116] S. P. de Alwis, "Anomaly cancellation in M-theory," Phys. Lett. **B392** (1997) 332-334, hep-th/9609211.

[117] J. O. Conrad, "Brane tensions and coupling constants from within M-theory," Phys. Lett. **B421** (1998) 119-124, hep-th/9708031.

[118] A. Bilal and S. Metzger, "Anomaly cancellation in M-theory: A critical review," Nucl. Phys. **B675** (2003) 416-446, hep-th/0307152.

[119] I. G. Moss, "Boundary terms for eleven-dimensional supergravity and M-theory," Phys. Lett. **B577** (2003) 71-75, hep-th/0308159.

[120] I. G. Moss, "Boundary terms for supergravity and heterotic M-theory," Nucl. Phys. **B729** (2005) 179-202, hep-th/0403106.

[121] I. G. Moss, "A new look at anomaly cancellation in heterotic M-theory," hep-th/0508227.

[122] J. Zinn-Justin, "Renormalization of gauge theories," SACLAY-D.PH-T-74-88, Oct 1974. 40pp. Lectures given at Int. Summer Inst. for Theoretical Physics, Jul 29 - Aug 9, 1974, Bonn, West Germany. Published in Bonn Conf. 1974, *Trends in Elementary Particle Theory,* Lecture Notes in Physics, vol. **37**, H. Rollnick and K. Dietz eds, Springer Verlag, Berlin (1975) 2-39.

[123] R. E. Kallosh, "Modified Feynman rules in supergravity," Nucl. Phys. **B141** (1978) 141-152.

[124] B. de Wit and J. W. van Holten, "Covariant Quantization Of Gauge Theories With Open Gauge Algebra," Phys. Lett. **B79** (1978) 389-393.

[125] I. A. Batalin and G. A. Vilkovisky, "Gauge algebra and quantization," Phys. Lett. **B102** (1981) 27-31.

[126] I. A. Batalin and G. A. Vilkovisky, "Feynman rules for reducible gauge theories," Phys. Lett. **B120** (1983) 166-170.

[127] I. A. Batalin and G. A. Vilkovisky, "Quantization of gauge theories with linearly dependent generators," Phys. Rev. **D28** (1983) 2567-2582, Erratum-ibid. **D30** (1984) 508.

[128] I. A. Batalin and G. A. Vilkovisky, "Existence theorem for gauge algebra," J. Math. Phys. **26** (1985) 172-184.

[129] I. A. Batalin and G. A. Vilkovisky, "Closure of the gauge algebra, generalized Lie equations and Feynman rules," Nucl. Phys. **B234** (1984) 106-124.

[130] W. Troost, P. van Nieuwenhuizen, and A. Van Proeyen, "Anomalies and the Batalin-Vilkovisky Lagrangian formalism," Nucl. Phys. **B333** (1990) 727-770.

[131] A. Van Proeyen, "Batalin-Vilkovisky Lagrangian Quantisation," in Proc. of *Strings and Symmetries 1991*, Stony Brook, N.Y., May 20-25 1991, hep-th/9109036.

[132] F. De Jonghe, "The Batalin-Vilkovisky Lagrangian quantisation scheme with applicatons to the study of anomalies in gauge theories," Ph. D. thesis, K. U. Leuven, 1994, hep-th/9403143.

[133] G. Barnich, F. Brandt, and M. Henneaux, "Local BRST cohomology in the antifield formalism. 1. General theorems," Commun. Math. Phys. **174** (1995) 57-92, hep-th/9405109.

[134] D. Anselmi, "Removal of divergences with the Batalin-Vilkovisky formalism," Class. Quant. Grav. **11** (1994) 2181-2204.

[135] J. Gomis, J. París and S. Samuel, "Antibracket, antifields and gauge theory quantization," Phys. Rept. **259** (1995) 1-145, hep-th/9412228.

[136] J. Gomis and S. Weinberg, "Are Nonrenormalizable Gauge Theories Renormalizable?," Nucl. Phys. **B469** (1996) 473-487, hep-th/9510087.

[137] A. Fuster, M. Henneaux and A. Maas, "BRST quantization: A short review," Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys. **2** (2005) 939-964, hep-th/0506098.

[138] F. De Jonghe, J. París and W. Troost, "The BPHZ renormalised BV master equation and Two-loop Anomalies in Chiral Gravities," Nucl. Phys. **B476** (1996) 559-610, hep-th/9603012.

[139] K. Symanzik, "Euclidean quantum field theory," in Local Quantum Theory, Proceedings of the International School of Physics "Enrico Fermi", Varenna Course **XLV**, R. Jost, Editor, Academic Press, New York (1969) 152-226.

[140] N. Nakanishi, *Graph Theory and Feynman Integrals*, Gordon and Breach, New York (1971).

[141] J. Douglas, "Minimal surfaces of higher topological structure," Ann. of Math. **40** (1939) 205-298.

[142] R. Courant, *Dirichlet's Principle, Conformal Mapping, and Minimal Surfaces*, Interscience, 1950.

[143] G. 't Hooft and M. J. G. Veltman, "Regularization And Renormalization Of Gauge Fields," Nucl. Phys. **B44** (1972) 189-213.

[144] C. G. Bollini and J. J. Giambiagi, “Dimensional Renormalization: The Number Of Dimensions As A Regularizing Parameter,” Nuovo Cim. **B12** (1972) 20-25.

[145] J. F. Ashmore, “A Method Of Gauge Invariant Regularization,” Lett. Nuovo Cim. **4** (1972) 289-290.

[146] G. M. Cicuta and E. Montaldi, “Analytic Renormalization Via Continuous Space Dimension,” Lett. Nuovo Cim. **4** (1972) 329-332.

[147] J. F. Ashmore, “On renormalization and complex space-time dimensions,” Commun. Math. Phys. **29** (1973) 177-187. Available online at: `http://projecteuclid.org/Dienst/UI/1.0/Summarize/euclid.cmp/1103858547?abstract=`

[148] J. C. Collins, *Renormalization,* Cambridge University Press (1984).

[149] R. Brunetti and K. Fredenhagen, “Microlocal analysis and interacting quantum field theories: Renormalization on physical backgrounds,” Commun. Math. Phys. **208** (2000) 623-661, math-ph/9903028.

[150] H. Epstein and V. Glaser, “The Role Of Locality In Perturbation Theory,” Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Phys. Theor. A **19** (1973) 211.

[151] T. S. Bunch, “BPHZ Renormalization Of $\lambda\phi^4$ Field Theory In Curved Space-Time,” Annals Phys. **131** (1981) 118-148.

[152] R. G. Leigh, D. Minic, and A. Yelnikov, “Solving Pure QCD in $2+1$ Dimensions, hep-th/0512111.